00094128

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

CURRENT COIN.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Tenth edition, crown 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

THOUGHTS FOR THE TIMES.

The author shows that the position of a clergyman in the National Church is that of a member of a National Community. As any citizen may give his opinion on any branch of State administration, or any professional man may express his views on the established dogmas of his profession, so, as a citizen and a professional man, the clergyman ought to be allowed a similar freedom of speech.

"Mr. Haweis writes not only fearlessly but with remarkable freshness and vigour. . . . As a preacher he commands a large and attentive audience."—*Saturday Review.*

"Our mental attitude towards the book was rather that of disciple than critic."—*Spectator.*

"Much originality of thought and individuality of expression."—*Pall Mall Gazette*

Fourth edition, crown 8vo, cloth, price 9s.

SPEECH IN SEASON.

"These discourses prove Mr. Haweis to be the possessor of very rare gifts of eloquence."—*Spectator.*

"Both in thought and language Mr. Haweis's discourses differ considerably from those ordinarily delivered from the pulpit."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

". . . . A wider and more rapid popularity than the late F. W. Robertson."—*Academy.*

"There is in them that which will commend them to the approval of the reading public. . . . They are marked by a freshness and novelty of treatment, a catholicity of spirit, and an earnestness of faith which make them pleasant and profitable reading, even to those who may least concur in the views of the preacher. . . . All the subjects are treated with great power."—*Leeds Mercury.*

Second edition, Square crown 8vo, cloth, price 3s. 6d.

UNSECTARIAN FAMILY PRAYERS,

For Morning and Evening for a Week, with short selected passages from the Bible.

"These prayers are tender, devotional, and helpful, and may be used with great profit in any household. They are brief, but very beautiful."—*Christian World.*

HENRY S. KING AND CO., LONDON.

CURRENT COIN.

£4128
a c

BY THE

REV. H. R. HAWEIS, M.A.,

Incumbent of St. James's, Marylebone, London. Author of "Thoughts for the Times," "Speech in Season," "Unsectarian Family Prayers," etc. etc.

mm-e-11

M M ell

HENRY S. KING AND CO., LONDON.

1876.

Qo'D
210
How/Car
94128
.P 1416.3

"I do not think that the controversy of the present day is with Superstition. I do think the controversy of the present day is with growing Infidelity, and I do think that if the Clergy of this our Church are not equal to the emergency, some great catastrophe will befall not only the Church but the Nation."—ARCHBISHOP TAIT'S CHARGE IN CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL, *September* 26, 1876.

(*The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved.*)

TO

Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D.,

THE VERY REVEREND THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER,

THIS VOLUME IS INSCRIBED,

WITH FEELINGS OF

ADMIRATION AND RESPECT,

BY

HUGH REGINALD HAWEIS, M.A.

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
LIBRARY
OF THE
BOMBAY
BRANCH
OF THE

PREFACE.

TENNYSON has said,—

"Though truths in manhood darkly join,
Deep-seated in our mystic frame,
We yield all blessing to the name
Of Him that made them 'current coin.'"

When choosing the title of my book, on reading the lines over again I perceived that the Poet was referring to our Lord Jesus Christ, who so presented new truth and *re*presented old in parable "and loveliness of perfect deeds" as to enable "Truth" to enter in at "lowly doors."

Small, indeed, may be the influence of any one teacher to give a current form to the ever new and living aspects of religion and morals—

too small, perchance, for his name to be remembered or for his memory to be blest; but still the humblest disciple may aspire to follow where He has led, and do his best to give in his own age and country new mould and currency to some of the well-worn and effaced coins which have nearly lost the Master's image and superscription.

The wise and learned have a paper currency which is intelligible to them, and which represents real value; but we still want their learned symbols of exchange converted into *current coin* for the people.

To explain to the many what is known to the few, but what ought to be common property—this is the simple object of the present volume.

In "Thoughts for the Times" I attempted to strike the key-notes of modern theology, religion, and life. In "Speech in Season" I applied the principles previously laid down to our present social needs and ecclesiastical institutions. In "Current Coin" I deal with some

questions, moral, scientific, and philanthropic, which seem to me to press for more immediate solution at the present moment.

"Current Coin" consists, in fact, of pulpit discourses and platform speeches, delivered in the course of the last year or two, selected and revised.

The original matter in them, if such there be, I am not anxious to claim, whilst throughout I desire to express my obligation generally, but deeply, to those whose wise thoughts and researches I have found most useful.

"Materialism" is little more than an attempt to give a still wider currency to Mr. Martineau's invaluable address at Manchester New College, London, and his subsequent papers on Modern Materialism in the *Contemporary Review*, vol. xxvii. But, in doing this, I have used freely Bain, Herbert Spencer, Maudsley, Buchner, G. Lewes, Croll, Crookes, A. Picton, and others.

The chief authority on "The Devil" is, of course, Roskoff's "History of the Devil," and

Reville's "Origin, Greatness, and Decadence of the Devil."

The mine of wealth consulted in "Crime" is the great repertory of facts and figures contained in "Prisons and Reformatories at Home and Abroad," published by the International Centenary Congress. I am also indebted to Mr. Alsager Hay Hill, of the *Labour News* Office, for numerous tracts and pamphlets bearing on the question.

In "Drunkenness" I owe much to Dr. Richardson, whose pamphlet on that subject supplied me with most of the materials for my republished speech at St. George's Hall. I have also consulted "Convocation Report," 1869, Dr. Carpenter's "Physiology of Temperance, &c.," *Quarterly Review*, October 1875, and a whole deluge of pamphlets issued by competing temperance societies and associations.

In "Pauperism," besides the "Blue Books," and a host of pamphlets supplied me also by my friend Mr. Alsager Hay Hill, I may mention the "Reports" of the Charity Organisation

Society, Prettyman's "Dispauperisation," *The Transatlantic*, August 1875, the "Gaol Cradle." I have also visited Elberfeld for the purpose of inquiring into the excellent poor relief system there.

"Recreation" and "Emotion" are two speeches delivered at South Place Institute, Finsbury Circus: the materials are of a light and general, but I hope suggestive, character, and seem to call for no special acknowledgment beyond that due to general reading.

The "Obiter Dicta" will be found to bear, after the manner of supplemental notes, upon sundry and related questions touched upon in the body of the book. I ventured to sow them there hastily as germs of thought capable of future expansion.

I commend this book first to the members of my own congregation, whose earnestness, intelligence, and love has cheered and sustained me in my present ministry for nine years. Secondly, to the large circle of friends and readers whose interest in questions of unspeak-

able importance has brought "Thoughts for the Times" through eleven editions, and "Speech in Season" through five. And, lastly, to that great general public, present and to come, who in different climes and ages, in spite of all hindrances, threats, and calumny, aspire to realise the words of the heavenly Master, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

H. R. HAWEIS.

16, *Welbeck Street,*
Cavendish Square.
October, 1876.

CONTENTS.

I

MATERIALISM.

		PAGE
1.	Nero's Water-Machines...	3
2.	Canon Liddon, Mr. Gladstone, and Father Hyacinthe	4
3.	The Real Strain of the Battle	5
4.	The Sleepers of To-day	5
5.	Butler and Paley...	6
6.	Louis XIV. and the Idol of Orthodoxy... ...	8
7.	Let the Clergy be honest	9
8.	Transition Times and the Ostrich-spirit ...	10
9.	Resettlement of Opinion, and our Leading Thinkers	11
10.	Resettlement of Religion must be Theological	12
11.	The Rising Generation of Religious Teachers ...	13
12.	New Religious Teaching *must* Come	14
13.	Far-seeing Toleration of the National Church ...	15

14. Modern Science on God 16
15. Materialism and Spiritualism 16
16. The Universe made without God 17
17. The Six Philosophers 18
18. Herschel on the Deflection of Forces 22
19. Objections to Mind in the Universe 24
20. Mind cannot move Matter 24
21. Force is blind 24
22. Mind requires an Organism 26
23. Anthropomorphic views of God 30
24. Recapitulation 30
25. The Sympathy between the Divine and Human 31
26. The Soul 32
27. From Matter to Soul, from Soul to Matter ... 33
28. Dependence of Mind on Matter 33
29. Identity of Mind and Matter unproved ... 34
30. Mr. Lewis cuts the knot 37
31. Is Mind a Property of Matter 39
32. The Material Argument breaks down 40
33. The Nature of the Soul 40
34. Unity of Divine and Human Will-Power ... 42
35. Nature and Human Nature require God and Soul 43
36. Modern Spiritualism 44

II.

THE DEVIL.

37. Case of Jenkins *versus* Cooke 46
38. Disembodied Spirits 47
39. Spirits in and out of the Body 48
40. How Divine Spirit acts on Human 50
41. The story of Eve, the Serpent and Apples ... 50

42. Its meaning 52
43. Symbolism unveiled 53
44. The Serpent of Genesis not the Devil 53
45. Who Satan was 55
46. What He Grew to be 56
47. His character deteriorates 57
48. He becomes Arch-Fiend 58
49. Recapitulation 59
50. Milton and the Bible 61
51. The Temptation of Christ 62
52. Christ's use of "Beelzebub" 63
53. Christ's use of Jewish phrases 63
54. Our Translators and Satan 64
55. When they are impartial 65
56. The Reporters of Christ... 66
57. Early Christian Devil 67
58. Popular Theology Devil 69
59. Middle-Age Devil 69
60. Satan on the Stage 70
61. The Earliest Picture of Satan 71
62. The Doctrine of the Devil 71
63. The Revival of the Devil 72
64. What is reasonable to believe 72
65. Our physical States 74
66. Devil or no Devil, we are free 76
67. The Good Voices 76

III.

CRIME.

68. Subject 78
69. One-sided Sympathy 78

70.	Class against Class	79
71.	What is done to cure Criminals?	80
72.	John Howard	80
73.	His Early Life	81
74.	Wife and Child	82
75.	Sheriff of Bedford	83
76.	State of the English Prisons	84
77.	York and Ely	85
78.	Out of Sight, out of Mind	85
79.	Everyone responsible	87
80.	Howard's Method	87
81.	Howard's First Principle	88
82.	Howard's Second Principle	90
83.	Howard's Third Principle	90
84.	Howard's Fourth Principle	90
85.	Howard's Fifth Principle	91
86.	Howard's Sixth Principle	91
87.	Compulsory Education of Children	92
88.	Compulsory Work	94
89.	What has been done for Children	95
90.	Our Street Arabs	96
91.	Rob Roy on the Arab	97
92.	Organise	98
93.	We Treat Children as Criminals	98
94,	The Case put	99
95.	Real Cases	100
96.	Case from the Gaol Cradle	101
97.	The School-Board not the Police-Court ...	102
98.	Deterrent Influences	103
99.	Causes of adult Crime	104
100.	The Objects of Punishment	104
101.	Hanging...	105
102.	Its uncertainty	106

MATERIALISM.

MATERIALISM.

1. Nero's Water-Machines.
2. Canon Liddon, Mr. Gladstone, and Father Hyacinthe.
3. The Real Strain of the Battle.
4. The Sleepers of To-day.
5. Butler and Paley.
6. Louis XIV. and the Idol of Orthodoxy.
7. Let the Clergy be honest.
8. Transition Times and the Ostrich-spirit.
9. Resettlement of Opinion, and our Leading Thinkers.
10. Resettlement of Religion must be Theological.
11. The Rising Generation and Religious Teachers.
12. New Religious Teaching *must* come.
13. Far-seeing Toleration of the National Church.
14. Modern Science on GOD.
15. Materialism and Spiritualism.
16. The Universe made without God.
17. The Six Philosophers.
18. Herschel on the Deflection of Forces.
19. Objections to Mind in the Universe.
20. Mind cannot move Matter.
21. Force is blind.
22. Mind requires an Organism.
23. Anthropomorphic views of God.
24. Recapitulation.
25. The Sympathy between the Divine and Human.
26. The Soul.
27. From Matter to Soul, from Soul to Matter.
28. Dependence of Mind on Matter.
29. Identity of Mind and Matter unproved.
30. Mr Lewes cuts the knot.
31. Is Mind a Property of Matter.
32. The Material Argument breaks down.
33. The Nature of the Soul.
34. Unity of Divine and Human Will-Power.
35. Nature and Human Nature require God and Soul.
36. Modern Spiritualism: a neglected view of the question.

I.

MATERIALISM.

SUETONIUS in the first century relates that when Nero heard of the overthrow of his power in Gaul, and the signs of the times clearly pointed to a collapse of his Empire at home, "He held a hasty consultation upon the present state of affairs, and spent the rest of the day in gravely consulting his Senators about some musical instruments to be played by water."

The future historian of the nineteenth century will have to relate that when the scientific provinces broke out in open revolt against established Theology, and the very foundations of Religion itself were threatened by Materialism, the defenders of the faith, blind to

the real points at issue, or giving them but a hasty and contemptuous glance, betook themselves to playing with water-machines.

2. The eloquent and earnest Canon Liddon is still entangled in the bad metaphysics of the Greek Fathers, and no one can deny that he makes sweet music enough with these water-machines. Verbal Inspiration is still the cry of the Evangelical clergy, whilst the narrower cry of an Established Church in bitter opposition to Dissent is the religious water-machine of at least two-thirds of the country clergy. Mr. Gladstone's well-known water-machine is the Protestant Church against Ultramontanism; whilst good Father Hyacinthe plays with a master-hand upon the terms of union between the Churches of Christendom, not perceiving that the foundation of all Churches is equally threatened; whilst the water-machine which still provides endless occupation to our theological scholars is the retranslation or the technical criticism of Bible texts.

And all this time the enemy is at the gate; and the only people who both love the city, and would go for its real defence, are shunned

as disturbers of the public peace. "You must not unsettle people's minds," they are told. "You must not divert their thoughts from orthodox religion." "You must not disturb them in the midst of their harmonious occupations," which consist shortly in grinding their various water-machines, of Greek metaphysics, verbal inspiration, Establishment, Protestantism, reunion of Christendom, or retranslation of the Bible.

3. But there are some who see that all these things may be left to settle themselves. The real strain of the battle in these days is elsewhere. It is not now a question of Catholic or Protestant Church, but of any Church at all; not a question of heaven or hell, but of any life beyond the grave; not a question of Trinity in unity, Christian or Theist views of God, but whether what the fool says in his heart, and some of the wise men of science and philosophy say with their lips, is true or not: "There is no God."

4. Is there a God?
If so, how is He to be thought of?

These are the real questions of the day, and beside them all others are trifles light as air, and the clergy who don't read what they call godless and ephemeral literature—that is, John Stuart Mill, Huxley, Tyndall, Bain, Herbert Spencer, and such triflers—the clergy and a large section of the religious world who seem to have no idea of what is really going on in the minds of thoughtful people — will some day awake, like Nero, at the eleventh hour, and turning from the water-machines which have lulled them into so fatal a sleep, find the cause of the Church lost through their apathy, and the city of God betrayed into the hands of the enemy.

5. In vain, at such an hour, will they hastily furbish up the good old arms of a bygone age. Paley's old round bores will burst in their hands. Butler's famous three-deckers have no iron plates to resist the new rifled cannon of science. Times have changed.

Paley and Butler did for their age what our clergy, if they can, ought to be doing for ours. They answered, and answered well, the objections offered to the religion of their day, retiring

from what was untenable or could not be defended; but they did not answer the objections offered in our day, because no one brought them forward.

Butler's foes objected to Christianity, but believed in a God, and they were answered when the acute Bishop showed them that the same objections which they urged against his belief in Christ could be urged against their own belief in God. Since his time people have begun to say seriously, "Just so, and therefore we reject both." Butler has left no answer to that position.

Paley, in his "Natural Theology," had to deal with people who spoke loosely about the fortuitous concourse of atoms and chance as having made the universe, not with men who spoke carefully about matter and force, specially determined under complex and peculiar relations; and the sneer with which he dismisses (chap. v. sect. iv.) something very like the Darwinian theory, "as an hypothesis hardly deserving consideration," should warn us of the danger of going to sea against the Armada of modern science in such ships as his.

6. In the Court of Louis XIV. it was thought shocking to hint that the king could ever die, and we read that one of the greatest French preachers, having in a rash moment begun his discourse with the words, "We are all mortal," added, with a deprecating glance at the throne, "except your majesty."

The idol of a conservative orthodoxy is seated on a throne as deeply undermined as was that of the Grand Monarque, and saluted daily with flattery as unblushing and insidious as that of Père Bourdaloue. "All things decay," say the preachers Sunday after Sunday, up and down the land, "except Conservative Orthodoxy."

In vain might Boileau and Molière insist after their fashion upon the impartial and pitiless law, and quote Horace to prove that Death with equal foot knocks at the door of high and low. The courtiers turned a deaf ear. In vain may warning fingers point to the decay of religious opinions once thought infallible and immortal. In vain may history blush to see the heterodoxies of yesterday installed by consent of bishops and clergy among the orthodoxies of to-day. When the present orthodoxies are threatened, the defenders of the faith will have

nothing to do with experience or history. Before them, as before Nebuchadnezzar, stands a great image, whose brightness is excellent, and whose form is terrible. Orthodox opinion is his name. Daniel may show that its foundation is but iron mixed with miry clay, and may tell of the stone cut without hands which is ready to smite the majestic idol, and break it in pieces. The people will still bow down before it, and utter the old and abject commonplace of stupidity and terror, "We are all mortal, except your majesty."

7. Now the first thing to do is to be honest. A teacher is often surprised to find that other hearts are bursting with thoughts which he has been afraid to utter for fear of shocking people. There is a time, no doubt, to keep silence, but there is also a time to speak. The time to speak is when the young are growing up without a religion, because they do not believe in the religious opinions of the old. The time to speak is when the old do not believe in their own religious opinions, but are afraid to say so, because they have nothing definite to put in their place.

All this is terrible only when silence is kept. When the truth is out about it, old and young, teacher and taught, heave a sigh of relief, and are surprised to find how the utterance of doubt has gone far to dissipate doubt itself, and re-establish faith in religion.

8. For now every one sees that each revival of religion has been preceded by the same sense of profound distrust in the old forms of doctrine. The doubt struggles, and at last finds utterance. Closely following upon the utterance comes the establishment of amended opinion, and the resettlement of religion.

Such was the action of the Prophets upon Moses, of the rabbinical lore upon the Prophets, of Christ upon the Rabbi, of the Pauline upon the narrow Jewish Christianity, of the Protestant upon the Roman Catholic Theology. And here we pause, for are we not on the eve of witnessing the action of science, historical criticism, and exact thought, upon the Catholic and the Protestant forms of Christianity?

In all this there is nothing terrible. It has been, and it will be. The times may be difficult, but to be silent about such changes as are im-

pending, nay, as are already upon us, is to bury our heads in the sand. The first thing for the clergy to put down in themselves and in their congregation is the Ostrich-spirit; or, to use another figure, to pretend that there is no change, when the change is come, is like shutting your eyes in a balloon car because you notice that the rotten cords which bind you to the balloon are snapping one by one. Before the last goes, it may be worth your while to descend, or to secure your car with sound cords; but in no case at such a moment is it well to shut your eyes, and tell your companion that all is safe.

9. But the clamour for restatement grows louder each day. The old religious textbooks are discredited. Parents have not the heart to teach their children that which they have had slowly and painfully to unlearn.

A head-master of one of the greatest and most honoured public schools said to me the other day, "I cannot follow orthodoxy in my religious teaching. My elder boys read and think for themselves—they worship the new lights, Spencer, Mill, Tyndall, and Darwin."

Of course they do—and why? Because these are the men who give relief to the mind and conscience of the age, by supplying it with positive knowledge and expressing its profound distrust of the current theology—and it is only with the help of such as these, that is, with the aid of best thinkers, that this or any age can rediscover and restate morality and religion. Their failure is not that they have done so much to demolish, but that they have done so little to reconstruct; but by rights they ought not to be called upon to reconstruct at all.

10. Religious reconstruction is not the province of Science or Philosophy, it is the province of Theology. If science and philosophy clear the ground, saying, "Repent," "Turn ye," it is enough. They are the forerunners, they purge and cleanse, but their baptism is of water alone, after them comes one mightier than they. Theology, with its eye for spiritual facts, with its open vision, and its inner consciousness, steps in at every such crisis at the propitious moment, like a new Avatar, with breath of the Spirit, the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost.

11. These are hard sayings, to some of course they must appear superfluous in the last degree. Just as in Elizabeth's time there were thousands who could not conceive what any one could want with a religion better than that of the Pope, or what there was to find fault with in the Mass and Seven Sacraments; so thousands now, and in every age, not moved by the spirit of the age, but still living mentally in the past, resent bitterly any interference with established religious opinion.

But look at the children, look at the young men, and the young women. They drink in the new opinions like mothers' milk. An air we still find some difficulty in breathing is their native air. Whilst we have been fighting and stifling doubt, a generation has sprung up in the last twenty years which takes for granted what we bungle and stammer over, and try to veil, and at last admit grudgingly and of necessity: such as, for instance, that the rainbow was not made by God at the time of the Flood, and that the sun didn't really stand still, and that the Athanasian Creed is not so clear as it looks, or so infallible as it sounds, or the books of the Bible written straight off by the

people whose names they bear, and so on *ad infinitum*.

And the slowness and timidity of religious teachers has resulted in this, that the rising generation of the upper and middle classes are slipping out of their hands, and that the great mass of the working classes, who have nothing to gain by conformity to established religion, have slipped out altogether.

Instead of the priests being in the front of the battle, they stop behind to cut down the deserters.

The business of restating and resettling opinion and restoring religion, the same in spirit, but changed in form, is not an easy or always a comfortable and pleasant task. All are not called upon to do it, but those who are professed teachers of religion must not shrink in a body from it, for that *is* their appointed task. Still less must they hinder those who, having put their hands to the plough, refuse to look back.

12. We are not all prophets. I and you may be able to do but little in the great work of religious reconstruction. The strength of some

who are devoted to religion may even be intellectually to sit still and be useful and good in their lives, in their parishes, in their institutions, rather than to actively teach religion.

But religion has to be taught. The work has to be done. The Ark of the Covenant has to be cared for and repaired, or the glory is sure to depart; and if we the clergy will not do this, others not the clergy, not the Pharisee, not the scribe, *will* spring up and become the religious teachers of the people, for religious teaching the people *will* have.

13. It is because the Established Church of England, whilst representing the organic stream of the national religion, allows me to say this: to proclaim aloud its history, to watch and chronicle the signs of the times, to plead for the enlargement of its boundaries and the reform of its doctrines; to do for religious truth, in however small a degree, in the present what prophets and apostles have at the risk of their lives done in the past—it is for this that I love, in its height, and depth, and length, and breadth, the Established Church of England.

But neither that or any other Church can

stand; unless the foundations upon which prophets and apostles built are still seen to be safe. No one who knows anything at all about the thoughts and feelings of the best and wisest men now living, can be blind to the fact that these foundations have been rudely shaken. And these foundations are two—GOD and the SOUL.

GOD.

14. The negative teaching of modern science is too clear to be mistaken. It is in effect this: Of God, if there be a God, we know and can know nothing.

The proofs from design are illusory, natural theology is altogether unreliable. It is doubtful whether we need even assume life, still less intelligence, for the construction of the universe.

Life and mind are the latest products of matter and force. Man is therefore, as far as we know, the highest example of life and mind hitherto developed.

15. Nothing can be more distinct than the two theories of the universe known as Materialism and Spiritualism.

By Materialism I mean the scheme which proposes to construct the universe out of organised matter and force, without resort to mind.

By Spiritualism (I speak not now of modern Spiritualism) I mean the scheme which assumes the operation of Divine Mind from the beginning.

Materialism presents life and mind as the outcome of matter and force. Spiritualism presents life and mind as immanent in, or regulating, both matter and force. Materialism places mind at the end, and calls it MAN; Spiritualism places mind at the beginning, and calls it GOD.

16. Now the less we can get the Universe out of, the better; for why should we assume more than is enough? If, for instance, matter alone is enough, then confine yourself to matter; if force, then to force. If you cannot get everything you want out of matter alone, or force alone, then take both together.

If even that is not enough, then take organised matter and various forces; and instead of Materialism call it Organicism, which is something very like matter, and force, and mind.

However, we shall come to that presently; meanwhile, I proceed to construct the Universe without God.

17. Our first philosopher says there is nothing but matter, make your universe out of that; but presently he observes that the motions of matter are not to be explained by anything observed *in* matter. We observe the motions of matter: these, therefore, may be claimed as predicates of matter, but not so the force which causes the movements in matter. That is not seen in the movements, it is inferred from them.

"Yes, truly," says philosopher No. 2, "*force* is all we want. Remove your matter, it is non-existent. Your so-called matter is known only by its properties, that is, its way of affecting ourselves; whether you call it extension with Descartes, or palpableness with Fechner, all you mean is something which causes sensations and acts on the mind; anything which did the same would be identical with matter. Your matter is simply force locally lodged, dynamic points, unextended centres of attraction and repulsion; in short, there is nothing but force in the universe.

This seems to do, until it appears evident that the force requires position, and has, moreover, to move from place to place; and as a material *nidus* is indispensable to every motory change, matter creeps in again as a conception indispensable to the existence of force.

"We cannot do without both," says philosopher No. 3. "They are, in fact, the intuitive data of all thought, and it would never answer to quarrel with an intuitive datum. To be sure we cannot prove the existence of either matter or force, all we have really to go upon is certain appearances and sensations. If we call these matter, we are driven to assume force; or if we call them forces, we are driven to assume matter before the forces can operate, for causal forces mean motion, and motion with nothing to be moved is inconceivable."

"But," says philosopher No. 4, "you get nothing but chaos out of matter in motion, until you introduce a law directing the motion; things must move in one way and not in another; there must be invariable modes of motion before you can get uniform results. Matter and force, before it can beget the world, must in fact obey law."

We are just starting fair, with matter and force, and law slipped in as an after-thought, to construct the universe, when philosopher No. 5 meets us with the apparently innocent remark, "After all, you cannot do much with simple material atoms, you must start with different kinds—about sixty-three different kinds. It is doubtful," adds the philosopher, apologetically, "whether merely mechanical forces acting on matter could produce life. We had better add to our conception atoms grouped into molecules of two kinds — organic as well as inorganic. We must have the globule which can turn itself inside out—an organic globule as well as the inorganic speck of steel dust that flies to the magnet."

Our suspicions are now fairly aroused, and we say, timidly, "You have got a good many things to start with. Are you sure you have not slipped in *mind,* as you almost confess that you have slipped in life?" "Well," says Professor Tyndall, "we must, if we want to discern in matter the promise and potency of all life, radically change our ideas of matter." In short, we must give it heterogeneity—force, life, and law; or, if we prefer to use Mr.

Lewis's words, we can only get the universe as we see it out of "matter and force, specially determined under peculiar and complex relations."

We now say more boldly, "And pray, how are you to slip in special determination and establish the 'peculiar and complex relations' which are to give birth to the various phenomena of life, consciousness, and mind, without slipping in mind itself at the earliest stage?"

Philosopher No. 6 here steps forward to the rescue, and with a lofty wave of the hand utters one word of explanation: "Causality!" I confess I care more for things than for words. I will therefore ask whether the explanation of this one word, "causality," does not cover all that I care to contend for when I say, "Divine Mind," immanent in matter, made the world and man.

If I should find on closer examination that any notion I can form of causality implies the existence of mind, I can shake hands with the philosophers all round—I shall be able to part with the last word—I shall say, "You have put into your conception of matter all that you had to get out of it by evolution."

It is the old hat-trick, a regular cornucopea

of wealth ; besides which you have popped sixty-three times behind the curtain to fetch another hat, and the whole thing has been so honestly done, that you have not cared to conceal one of your devices. "Causality," no doubt, explains everything, but is causality anything but mind immanent in matter. Let us see.

18. The only causality of which we are directly conscious is our own ; that is, the effort put forth by the mind, when it employs force to move matter. So H. Weber identifies the essence of power with will. Mr. Martineau further adduces the following remarkable words of Herschel, which, as he truly says, have been often criticised but never shaken :—"That it is our immediate consciousness of effort when we exert force to put matter in motion, or to oppose and neutralise force, which gives us this internal conviction of power and causation, so far as it refers to the material world, and compels us to believe that whenever we see material objects put in motion from a state of rest, or deflected from their rectilinear paths and changed in their velocities if already in motion, it is in consequence of such an effort somehow exerted,

though not accompanied with our consciousness."

Now causal power, as we see it in the universe and in man, means force; but it means force and something more. It means force determined in one way, and not in another. How comes this? Force itself may be blind, the sum of it may be constant in the universe. But that which determines the direction of force cannot be blind. Nor can force itself determine force, as Professor Croll says (*Journal of Science*, 1873, p. 431): "The action of a force cannot be determined by a force, nor can motion be determined by motion." The world, as we know it, is the result of the deflection of forces, forces sent along special lines. Now we know that the mere deflection of force uses up no energy; for instance, no energy is required to deflect a bullet from its path, provided the deflecting force acts always at right angles ("Unseen Universe," p. 180).

The *determination* of force, a thing in itself which neither increases nor diminishes the sum of force in the universe, is the *mind-element* in causal power—is that thing not force which guides force.

19. The essence of human causality is mind, will; nor can we conceive of any causal power, not chaotic, which does not imply mind and will.

a. The immediate reply to this is, first that mind is not power, and cannot move a particle of matter.

b. That the forces of nature are blind and mechanical.

c. That mind requires an organism.

d. That to import the notion of mind and will into the operations of external nature is to create an imaginary Divine Mind in our own image—is in fact the old anthropomorphism so often condemned.

20. *a. Mind cannot move matter.* Yet the determination of force, or the effort we use to direct force, *is* mind, and conscious will, nor can itbe conceived of as anything else. Mind, without being "energy," may still deflect and thus guide force, an operation using up no "energy."

21. *b. That the forces of nature are blind and unconscious though orderly.* They may nevertheless be connected in their operation with

Divine Will: just as a man who walks, or performs any other act automatically, does so without any conscious effort of will. Still the act is due to an operation of his mind become subordinate and fixed by long and continued habit. Once his whole mind was concentrated upon the act of walking. An intense will and purpose (notice a young child's efforts to walk) fixed the habit or law of his locomotion, which now goes on by itself. The habit once fixed, his mind is set free for the exercise of higher functions, so that whilst he walks he need think not *at all* of his legs, but can read a book.

If the universe as we conjecture is animated with eternal consciousness, that consciousness or Divine Will may have followed in the Macrocosm, or big world, the course which our consciousness follows in the Microcosm, or little world of our own mind and body.

Professors Tait and Balfour Stewart affirm that the argument derived from an examination of the nature of matter is in favour "of the production of the visible universe by means of an intelligent agency residing in an invisible universe." Following the laws known to us in

our own intelligence, the stream of Divine thought and will would, as Mr. Martineau says, first apply itself to disposing of new conditions, setting up order by differentiation, and general origination of plan.

Thus may have been formed what Martineau finely calls the "habits of the universe;" that is, the laws of nature, due originally to Mind but now far removed from mind or consciousness. "The more mechanical a natural law may be, the farther it is removed from its source, and the organic and unconscious portion of the world, instead of being the potentiality of the organic and conscious is rather the residual precipitate formed as the indwelling Mind of all concentrates an intenser aim on the upper margin of the ordered whole, and especially on the inner life of natures that resemble Him" (p. 537).

22. *c. That mind is inconceivable apart from a nervous system and brain.*

Mr. Lewis, and the modern school of physicists generally, deny the possibility of intelligence, not the result of organic processes. "No brain," say they, "no mind."

When we speak of Divine Mind, the Divine brain is inquired for.

To this Mr. Martineau replies, "It is when mental power has to be localised, bounded, lent out to individual natures, and assigned to a scene of definite relations, that a focus must be found for it."

It is true that we can have no immediate knowledge of mind except our own, but it is also true that through our own minds we are able to recognise *products stamped with thought.* Are there none such in the universe?

Mr. Bain ("Body and Mind," p. 133), whilst declaring that without organised matter "we should not have mental states at all," admits in the same volume (p. 127) that "for anything we know mind might have existed apart, in a way that we cannot figure to ourselves for want of some example within our reach." This is in truth the spiritualist ground, which declares the independence of mind and matter. But in a flight of daring fancy, the spiritualist, in the person of Mr. Martineau, is willing to satisfy the organicist by a speculation which unites the universal Mind organically with the universe itself. Here are his own eloquent words: "If

still my questioner cannot dispense with some visible structure as the organ of the ever-living Mind, I will ask him in his conception of the brain to take into account these words of Cauchy's: 'Ampère has shown that the molecules of different bodies may be regarded as composed each of several atoms, the dimensions of which are infinitely small, relatively to their separating distances. If, then, we could see the constituent molecules of the different bodies brought under our notice, they would present to our view hosts of constellations, and in passing from the infinitely great to the infinitely small, we should find in the ultimate particles of matter, or in the immensity of the heavens, central points of action distributed in presence of each other.' If, then," continues Mr. Martineau, "the invisible molecular structure and movements of the brain do but repeat in little those of the heavens, what hinders us from inverting the analogy and saying that the ordered heavens repeat the rhythm of the cerebral particles? You need an embodied Mind. Lift up your eyes and look upon the arch of night as the brow of the Eternal, its constellations as the molecules of the

universal consciousness, its space as their possibility of change, and the ethereal waves as the afferents and efferents of omniscient thought" (p. 540).

And yet it may be asked, If God *is*, why is He never seen? If force, why is *it* never seen? If consciousness in man is, why is *it* never seen? Range the whole world through, test and weigh. You cannot light upon a single dynamic idea (Martineau). You find, not force, only movements, only relations of coexistence and sequence.

Open the brain, examine with your scalpel the nervous system. You come upon no consciousness, only vibrations of molecules; yet you know that consciousness *is*.

Examine space with the telescope, analyse light with the spectrum. You find no God. What does that prove? Not that God does not exist any more than that consciousness does not exist, but that you have not used the right method for His discovery, or drawn the correct inference from observed phenomena.

Who shall gainsay us if we declare that causality, as seen in the operation of nature and nature's laws, means force directed, that

what directs force is not, and cannot be, seen, but thought, *because it is thought?*

Causality, therefore, is clearly beyond the range of experimental science.

Human causality can only be known through conscious thought, and Divine causality can only be inferred in the same way and known in the same way; not by the scalpel or telescope, but by thought.

23. *d.* And all this is said to be anthropomorphism! We are accused of it when we attribute living intelligence to the one Power that underlies the changing mask of material phenomena. We are taunted with making God in our own image. Be it so. "If I am to see a ruling Power in the world, is it folly to prefer a man-like to a brute-like power, a seeing to a blind? The similitude to man means no more and goes no farther than the supremacy of intellectual insight and moral ends over every inferior alternative" (Martineau).

24. Mind, then, seems to us to have been slipped into the mysterious "atoms specially determined," and into the "complex and pecu-

liar relations," without which our philosophers cannot construct the universe.

Mind is, in its last analysis, identical with that which determines the direction of force. Force and matter so determined possess, if you will, the promise and potency of all life. Mind really underlies even those phenomena of the universe which at first seem most mechanical.

Mind working through matter organised in a certain way is yet conceivable as working without it.

Mind of the same kind as that of man does not degrade man's idea of God, since to attribute that to God is merely to invest Him with the highest known attribute of conscious life.

This is the power then we see enthroned in the universe, and the expression of this living energy is ancient and familiar, simple but sublime. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made."

25. We need make but one step more, and

the sympathetic relations between God and man are unveiled.

Mind presupposes self-conscious life. The step from living self-conscious mind to sympathy or love is quickly made—for sympathy is but a natural function or exercise of mind when mind converses with an object capable of exciting it.

Face to face with a rock I may understand *it*, but *it* cannot understand me, or feel me, or respond to me, therefore I neither care for it affectionally, nor can I sympathise with it in any way.

Face to face with a human being, or even an animal, I discern *that* to which I can give feeling, and it will know, which can give me feeling, and I shall know. It is an object of sympathy, or antipathy; in its presence my mind has ceased to be merely cognitive, and I am stirred affectionally.

Now lift this familiar thought into the sphere of the eternal relations.

Admitted that mind in the universe is homogeneous, of the same kind as mind in man, and what hinders the establishment of affectional relations between the Divine and the human,

between God and man? His act towards me is not merely cognitive, because I can feel Him, and He can feel me.

He seeks in me the reflection of Himself. He loves in me the evolution of the perfect out of the imperfect. He pours out upon me (now but a rudiment of what I may become) the life that is in Himself, that I may rise into higher life, and win freer relations through my successive stages of heavenly trial and discipline.

In Him I live, and move, and have my being —I am made to feel it, and know it, as He feels it and knows it. It is true that in emerging out of my chrysalis state of infancy into the light of day I find myself all through this present stage entangled strangely with "the unconscious habits of the universe." Its laws act and react upon me pitilessly, yet they are my best teachers and trainers. The lower lessons must be learned, and it may be that the path of suffering is the only road to the higher life, as it certainly is to the higher knowledge; but none of these things move me, for although I see through a glass darkly, no one can convince me that I do not see at all, or that what I see is as the baseless fabric of a dream;

for above the depression of failure, and the pain of loss, and the anxieties of an earth-clogged body and mind, ring out the words of an unfaltering trust, which awaken within me undying echoes: "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men, and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not."

THE SOUL.

26. I pass now from God the great Oversoul to man. I ask whether or not man is made in God's image—whether his life and consciousness is but the product of force and matter specially determined and presently to be dissolved, or whether there is about him anything capable of surviving the material shock and redistribution of atoms which we call death?

The way has been cleared. If we could have interpreted the universe without an Oversoul, we might have done without a soul in man. But if that thing which directs force and determines the molecular arrangement of matter is itself neither force nor matter but God, then that thing which directs consciousness and deter-

mines the flow of mental life may be neither matter nor force, but SOUL.

At first nothing seems more convincing than the material view, but at last nothing less so. A few sentences are sufficient at first sight to conduct us to an immediate and irrevocable dissolution.

27. Motion set up in the cooling of a nebulous mass has first introduced a separation of the common mass into parts or set up differentiation. Mechanical and chemical forces produce life; vibrating molecules in a certain order evolve consciousness, and a special intensity of consciousness is what we call soul. *Thus matter into soul.*

Reverse the process, and you get first the molecular arrangement called consciousness interrupted, *i.e.*, death; or the form of molecular motion called life checked. Then follows the general redistribution of atoms which once formed a human body and soul. All these part company and become once more the sport of chemical and mechanical forces. *Thus soul into matter.*

28. If you want more proof that mind is a

product of matter, see how you play upon it, and modify it, by playing upon and modifying matter. Strike the head in one place, and you destroy memory: in another, and you paralyse consciousness itself. Stimulate the brain, and the mind is active and capable of great things: starve it, and the mind is dull and capable of nothing.

Not only for every thought, but for every sensation there is a corresponding motion of matter. Until the matter moves in a certain way the thought *is not*, the feeling *is not*.

When, as in death, that certain method of motion is for ever suspended, there can be no thought, no sensation.

29. At first all this seems convincing enough: why is it not so at last?

Because you have still not shown the identity of mind and matter, nor even the nature of their connection.

All you have shown is that mind and body move simultaneously on parallel planes, but the leap in the dark is made when you cross from one to the other, and maintain that the body-plane is essential, not only to the manifestation, but to the existence of the soul-plane.

Dr. Buchner, himself a thorough-going materialist, says: "In the relations of brain and soul, phenomena occur which cannot be explained from the simple physical relation of matter and force." If this does not mean that force and matter alone won't make soul, what does it mean? Or to put it shortly, matter and force + x = soul; or, perhaps more clearly still, we may say that matter and force provide the conditions without which x or soul cannot manifest itself to beings like us, whose own x or soul is at present enveloped in and expressed through matter and force.

Wendell Holmes points out that matter cannot be converted into a mind equivalent. In the correlation of the physical forces you can show how light is converted into heat, heat into magnetism, and magnetism into motion: but you cannot convert heat, or any other force in connection with matter, into mind. You cannot show a mind-equivalent for food, although you can supply the brain through food with thought-power. You cannot show the steps between physical motion and thought-power. You cannot express mind in terms of matter, or matter in terms of mind.

Professor Huxley has cautiously declined to say that there is nothing in the universe besides matter and force.

Tyndall gives the spiritualist all the negative conditions he can possibly require, for he expressly asserts that molecular groupings and movements in reality explain nothing, and that the utmost he can affirm is the association of two classes of phenomena, of whose real bond of union he is in absolute ignorance.

In other words, the phenomena of mind and matter are absolutely distinct; in short, a thought and a molecule can have nothing in common but momentary association.

How does vibration become sensation?

How does molecular change become thought? We know not.

Before you prove that a dispersion of molecules means the extinction of the soul, you must show the links that connect body and soul. You cannot.

You must prove that they are not casually and accidentally, but essentially allied. You cannot.

You must explain the passage from one to the other. It is unthinkable.

You must show that one can be converted into the other. It cannot, for there is no really physical equivalent for soul. Soul = (matter and force) + x.

30. But now we come to the oddest phase of the controversy. The last tactic of the materialist school is highly characteristic of the astonishing manner in which philosophers cheat themselves with words.

First the dualism between mind and matter is fully admitted. Nothing, it is said, can be more distinct than the opposition between the notion of thought and molecular motion. And yet this dualism has to be mentally resolved, in order to demonstrate how completely soul after all is accounted for by matter and force.

A more extraordinary piece of unconscious legerdemain we never met with than in the following late utterance in the *Fortnightly Review*, by a justly esteemed writer. "So long as the old dualism between matter and mind is not resolved into the dual aspect of *objective* and *subjective*, *the intellectual difficulty here emphasised* (that is, the difficulty of connecting mind and matter) *will sustain the spiritual*

hypothesis (that is, that mind and matter have a separate existence). Ideally, and for convenience, we dissociate the subjective from the objective, the mental from the material, feeling from matter; but when we suppose a real separation corresponds to this ideal distinction, we are thrown back upon the mystery of how a vibration becomes a sensation."

Exactly so. Then follows one of those astonishing feats of conjuring with those famous balls, the OBJECTIVE and the SUBJECTIVE. "*The mystery is an illusion. There is no such transformation.* The material process *is* the objective aspect of the subjective mental process;" that is:—

Viewed objectively, thought = certain molecular motions.

Viewed subjectively, certain molecular motions = thought.

And this is the latest philosophical discovery, which is to destroy for ever the false dualism between mind and matter. But simply to state that matter is mind, and mind is matter, is not to explain but to dogmatise.

What has been done? The two conceptions allowed to be distinct are repeated. One and

the same phenomenon of molecular motion is then declared to underlie them both, and the two conceptions are left just where they were before, and the mystery is just as great as ever. It does not help me to be told that my thought is a molecular motion viewed subjectively. I want to know how that or anything else *comes to be viewed subjectively*, or how the subject can view the object at all. I am told that thought is molecular motion viewed subjectively. I ask, *What* views it subjectively? I have nothing to fall back upon to explain this state called subjective but "molecular motion."

It seems to me, then, that *what* views molecular motion subjectively is, in fact, *molecular motion*, which sounds very like molecular nonsense.

31. But perhaps you can make thought a property of matter? You may make anything a property of matter which you can observe in it, that is, all its movements; but not what you cannot observe, that is, not the power which causes the movements. If you cannot even find the power which moves matter *in* matter, much less can you find *that* which directs

the power which moves matter. Neither power nor will — that is, the elements of the subjective — are to be got out of molecular motion. Hence the statement that mind is matter subjectively viewed remains an unverified assertion, and "the intellectual difficulty here emphasised," to use Mr. Lewis's own words, seems to us still to "sustain the spiritual hypothesis."

32. But when we have found an answer to those who identify soul and body, and who say that the soul cannot survive the body, we have by no means proved that the soul *does* survive. The crushing material argument against the existence and survival of the soul breaks down, but the nature and prospects of the soul itself remain unexplained.

What is its nature? What are its prospects? How are these things to be known?

33. A few words must suffice to indicate the direction in which all future answers to these questions must travel. Our present object is not to dilate upon so vast a topic, but to indicate the kind of arguments fit to meet the

peculiar negations of the age in the peculiar form in which they commonly come before us.

If the soul be not body, what is the soul? Mr. A. Picton has observed that all creatures, man and animals, are made up of two factors—

1 part of the universal substance

2 forces which define and limit that part.

Personality is the produce of a certain intensity in this definition, and is as capable of degree and development as is bodily form. Personality or crystallised substance survives the shock of death, for death is only the dissolution of forces needed at first to define personal conditions under the form of matter. Just as God is in the universe that power which directs force and matter, but which is neither; so the soul, or that which is self-conscious and permanent in man, is that power which directs force and matter in man, but is itself neither force nor matter.

Thus Divine Will and human will are homogeneous. That is why the soul of man is religious. It claims affinity with the universal Will. It is at peace with itself when in harmony with that Will. Its happiness is to discover and to do that Will; its misery is to thwart it. "This

is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."

34. By accepting as a spiritual axiom the essential unity of the Power within us and without us which is able to direct force, we are at once lifted into a world of eternal relations. It becomes reasonable for us to aspire and to pray. The God-consciousness within is no more a dream or a surmise of the individual, but something immanent in the development of the race. It rises out of a private dream or speculation into the dignity of a generic consciousness.

That in some ages religion has been developed amiss, or that in some souls there should be hardly any perception of it at all, is no real damage to its eternal foundation. All faculties have been developed amiss, especially the emotional faculties, but as the misuse and abuse of the appetite on which depends the continuation of the race is no proof of the non-existence of a legitimate use, so the existence of false or cruel religions is no argument against the Divine foundation of religion itself.

In this world everything is a matter of development, and religion is a matter of develop-

ment, but to attempt to develop religion without a soul and without a God is to build a castle with nothing, and to place it in no man's land.

35. The usual philosophical account of religion is good enough as an explanation of a process, provided that the revelation of religion is seen all along to be the slow discovery to man of his eternal affinities; but as a solution of the ultimate *whence* and *whither*, those who begin without a soul, and finish without a God, leave the immense fabric of inherited emotion and crystallised experiences of utility without any real source or adequate sanction.

But to one who sees from the first the enthronisation of Divine Mind, and recognises the unity of that directing power throughout nature and human nature, the history of religion is the one glimpse (fugitive and imperfect) which we are allowed in a moment of time to gain of the eternal soul-culture that is to proceed throughout the ages.

As time rolls on, this world becomes a higher training-ground, but the story of each soul as it passes from its earth-envelope is shrouded in obscurity, and all we can know is the collective

but momentary history of souls in the past, and the actual experiences of our own and other spirits in the present, as dealt with by the eternal "Power which makes for righteousness."

36. Lastly, one word about modern Spiritualism. I am doubtful how far the theories advanced in my former volume, "Speech in Season," will bear to be pressed into all the details I have there discussed, although I adhere to my general opinion that many of the miraculous phenomena reported in the Old and New Testaments bear the closest resemblance and affinity to the alleged phenomena of modern Spiritualism. Into the truth or falsehood of these I do not propose to enter here, but I wish to point out the secret of the fascination exercised by these alleged occurrences over many thoughtful and superior minds. The important question is, not so much whether or no the thing looks trivial, or whether or not the dead are trying to communicate, although of course that is important, but whether the phenomena witnessed prove the possibility of intelligence of some kind, human or otherwise, living and acting upon matter

without the brain and nervous system declared by physiologists to be indispensable to the very existence of any intelligence.

This is the real reason why modern Spiritualism cannot get a hearing with most scientific men.

The latest position of science is that mind itself is the product of matter and force, organised in such a system as man's.

Without such a material nervous system, mind, it is repeated *ad nauseam*, cannot exist, much less manifest itself.

Modern Spiritualism affects to supply direct evidence to the contrary. It offers to produce intelligence of some kind, acting upon matter, and yet unconnected with a brain and a nervous system.

If this could be proved, the materialist argument would at once fall, for if intelligence similar to ours exists, and can operate outside the usual organised conditions, our own souls *may*—we do not say *must*—do the same. God is conceivable, and intelligence ceases to be the mere product of force and matter specially organised.

THE DEVIL.

THE DEVIL.

37. Case of Jenkins *versus* Cooke.
38. Disembodied Spirits.
39. Spirits in and out of the Body.
40. How Divine Spirit acts on Human.
41. The story of Eve, the Serpent and Apples.
42. Its meaning.
43. Symbolism unveiled.
44. The Serpent of Genesis not the Devil.
45 Who Satan was.
46. What He grew to be.
47. His character deteriorates.
48. He becomes Arch-Fiend.
49. Recapitulation.
50. Milton and the Bible.
51. The Temptation of Christ.
52. Christ's use of "Beelzebub."
53. Christ's use of Jewish phrases.
54. Our Translators and Satan.
55. When they are impartial.
56. The Reporters of Christ.
57. Early Christian Devil.
58. Popular Theology Devil.
59. Middle Age Devil.
60. Satan on the Stage.
61. The Earliest Picture of Satan.
62. The Doctrine of the Devil.
63. The Revival of the Devil.
64. What is reasonable to believe.
65. Our physical States.
66. Devil or no Devil, we are free.
67. The Good Voices.

II.

THE DEVIL.

I AM going to speak on the subject of the Devil. I shall say nothing uncivil of the poor clergyman who wanted to get his parishioner to say he believed in the Devil before he consented to give him the sacrament, nor of the sentence reversed on appeal to the Privy Council. It may be a satisfaction for common folk to know that a man's disbelief in the personality of the Arch-Fiend does not constitute him "a notorious evil liver," or necessarily "a depraver of the Book of Common Prayer." So much good has come out of the late case of Jenkins *versus* Cooke. But it is strange indeed to see the Foul Fiend (commonly known as

the Devil) dragged from the seclusion of theological repose, and brought face to face with the modern world, which has certainly of late somewhat neglected his claims to real sovereignty. To-day I shall try to lay before you information of a character which will help you to make up your minds about the personality of the Devil; and I shall also not disguise from you my own opinions upon this question.

38. I may as well tell you at once the nature of my opinions. I think then it would be very difficult to establish the existence of one particular Arch-Fiend, the king of devils; but it seems to me quite rational and quite believable that there should be bad influences connected with personality or directed by intelligence, not only in the present visible world, but also in other worlds; and I don't see any impossibility in such bad influences connected with personality out of the flesh, conversing with, and to some extent influencing the brains of human beings, that is, of spirits still in the flesh. Modern science shows us the wonderful nature of the forces which surround us here; how that

light itself exercises all the mighty influences of dynamic power, the force of which can be easily measured.

How strange and subtile are the vibrations of heat-rays, capable of going through brick walls; or rays of light, capable of passing through glass, and being variously decomposed. How strange and unexplained is their chemical action. Think of electricity, and its curious connection with nerve-force, of which it may be only one subtile modification. Some such agency as that, being controlled and directed by external intelligence, may be used as an instrument for setting up brain-waves and creating in the mind impulses and thoughts. For every thought demands a certain vibration in the brain: control that, and you control the thought. A message can be flashed by electricity, as well as spoken or sent through the post; and the wires of the brain can be pulled by a subtile vibration addressed to the ear through the air, or to the eye through light, or directly to the brain molecules sensitive to electric action.

39. Most of you believe, I suppose, in the

survival of your own spirits, and when you say so you mean the exercise of personality under conditions not like these present ones, conditions not now known or understood, but hereafter to be realised. Yet you believe in the survival of your own personality. Well, there is no reason why you should not believe that when you pass away from this sphere you may find borderland conditions through which you may influence those who have not passed away, since personality at least constitutes something common to both spheres, and is presumably independent of the body as commonly understood; and if you are a bad spirit you may be able to be attracted towards those that are bad, and influence them for bad. You are then their devil. And if you are a good spirit when you pass away, you may be able to be attracted to those who are on a similar moral plane, or who need you sympathetically, and you through sympathy will act upon them for good, and then you will be their good angel.

Such a speculation is recognised in the words of the Prayer Book: "O God, who hast constituted the services of angels and men in a wonderful order."

40. But whether you think devils and angels are departed human beings, or spirits intelligent but not human, or whether you deny altogether the possibility of spirits affecting the brains of mortals (except when spirits are human beings clothed in flesh), most of you who believe in God believe that He is a Spirit, and that He does visit the spirits of men through their brains. That is the assumption of every religion. But how does He do it? There must be an agency. The spirit in its present state is not reached except through its physical organ, the brain; vibrations are set up there, somehow, by what we call the Holy Spirit. That Holy Spirit must use some force. And there you open the door, you stumble upon the rationale of Divine communion; you have the belief which makes the utilisation of subtile physical forces altogether reasonable, and if such are used by a Divine spirit there is no reason why they should not be used (even as we use them) by spirits less divine, human or angelic; it matters not, and we know not.

41. So much by way of general preface, and now for the information which will enable

you to come to a conclusion about the personality of the Devil, on the ground of what is to be found in the Bible.

The story of Eve and the serpent has generally been supposed to refer to the story of the first woman tempted by the Devil; but there is nothing in the narrative itself to lead you to suppose that the serpent is the Devil. We have brought the Devil into a great many parts of the Old Testament where he has really no place. He abounds in the last book of the New Testament, and we have taken that old serpent the Devil, and read him into Genesis the first book of the Old Testament. I place the book of Revelation this morning quite outside the controversy, chiefly because it is so late, and so symbolical and figurative that it will not serve to establish any point of dogmatic theology. I shall have to treat the Revelation separately, on another occasion. I leave it on one side for the present, and I say that all we know about the serpent who tempted Eve from Genesis is that he was a serpent, and that he is said to have spoken to the woman, to have tempted her, and to have been condemned to go on his belly in conse-

quence. St. Paul (who probably accepted the Jewish Devil) does not identify the serpent with the Devil, 2 Corinthians xi. 3, he merely says the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety; nor is there any other allusion to the serpent of Genesis in the New Testament.

42. Now all we know about this story of Eve's temptation by the serpent with the apples[1] is that it is one of a large number of similar stories connected with tree-worship and serpent-worship, not peculjar to the Jews but common throughout the East, and that it covered beneath the symbolism of the serpent and the fruit an allusion to the seductive nature of the earthly desires. I need not say that this has been long known to every student of theological lore, and why it is systematically withheld from the people the clergy will some day have to explain. The fact is that we know, as a rule, so much about Jewish religion, and so little about other religions, that we have been led to think that the story of Eden was peculiar to

[1] See an "Armen-Bibel," in Dresden Library (*circ.* 1400), with woodcut of Eve holding two apples. Also picture in Dresden Gallery (No. 1,744), by Lucas Cranach.

the Jews; but in fact it is a parable of human nature, and is for all time, its symbols are those of our common humanity, and its lesson is the lesson of our common experience.

43. But if the story of Eden, of the apples and the serpent, is prevalent throughout the religion of the East, is it not because it is true? The reply is simple. Discover that of which the story is a symbol, and you have explained the story. Just as, when you have discovered that Apollo's arrows mean the rays of the sun, you seek no further for an historical Apollo, so when you discover the nature of serpent-worship you understand the story of Eve's temptation, together with all stories of a similar class, without the dull conversion of myth into history, still alas! popular with the literal but illiterate school of theologians.

44. The famous prophecy, "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," commonly interpreted to mean that the woman's seed, Christ, should bruise the head of the serpent, that is, the Devil, is only one more instance of the common ransacking of the Bible for

Messianic texts, quite excusable amongst the Jewish Rabbi, but inexcusable in fair-minded Christian scholars. When the words were written the doctrine of a chief Devil, as I shall presently show, was not known. The words simply imply the victory of the carnal desires in the bruising of the woman's heel, symbol of humanity in its lower aspects, but the *ultimate* and ever-growing subordination of the lower nature in the higher progress and development of the race; in other words, to understand the bruising of the serpent's head, compare the relations of the sexes in a well-regulated society and in primitive or savage life, and the fulfilment of the prophecy will be evident.

So far from the serpent in the Jewish version of the story being the Devil, Roskoff in his History of the Devil has conclusively shown that such a dualism was so abhorrent at this time to the Jews, that although in the original Eastern but un-Jewish myth from which the story of Eden is derived the tempter is a kind of sublime demon, he is reduced in Genesis to the humble position of the "most subtle of the beasts." Roskoff in his elaborate work has

shown in the same way that the mysterious Azazel, to whom a goat was offered, was not a real being, but only the personification of uncleanness, the monotheistic feeling of the Jews again reducing this evil deity to a mere shadowy abstraction. Neither Azazel nor the serpent then can be taken for the Devil of a later creed.

45 There is no mention of Satan at all in the Old Testament, except in the later books of Job, Zechariah, and the first book of the Chronicles. Of evil spirits there is mention—Saul's evil spirit, lying spirits in the mouths of the prophets, &c.—but not of the King-Devil. All through the earliest books we have no allusion whatever, as far as I can see, to any Arch-Fiend or Chief-Devil: on the contrary, all the functions that we have attributed for ages to the Devil were in the early times referred to Jehovah Himself.

It was Jehovah, the God of the Jews, who was said to destroy, to provoke, to harden. It was not the Devil, it was God who hardened Pharaoh's heart, God who destroyed Pharaoh's host, God who "moved" David to number the people. And here I come to the very

link where the functions of Jehovah in the Jewish theology are seen passing over to the Arch-Fiend; for notice that in the earlier book of Samuel (2 Sam. xxiv.) it is said that God "moved" David to number the people of Israel, whereas in a later book (1 Chron. xxi.) *Satan* is said to "provoke" him to number the people. We can see the spiritual sensitiveness of the race growing and developing, until the Jews found it impossible to credit Jehovah with tempting His people. As St. James says, "God tempteth no man, neither is He tempted of any," &c., so gradually all functions dishonouring to the Deity, although originally attributed to Him, were transferred to one of His celestial agents, not yet distinguished as the Arch-Fiend but a "son of God," a chief prosecutor, an accuser of the brethren, or a satan, which means an "adversary"—not yet of God, only of man.

46. We must now fasten our attention closely upon this celestial prosecutor or satan, and we shall see how step by step he grows in importance, until he ends in the Arch-Fiend of the popular theology.

Turn to the book of Job i. 6, there you will

read that when the sons of God came to present themselves before Him, "Satan came also among them." From always accusing the brethren he had grown distrustful of human goodness, and did not believe even in Job, so, quite as an instrument of Divine discipline, and in accordance with the counsels of Jehovah, he proceeds to try the patriarch. I find no trace as yet of any enmity between God and Satan, he is among the sons of God, goes in and out of heaven at will, and is employed by God in the Divine discipline of Job.

Again, when Bâlaam was met in the narrow way by an "angel of God," he was in fact met by Satan, for we read, "The angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary [or satan] against him." That angel of God is in fact here called a satan, in so many words, but we have not yet come to the Arch-Fiend, or infernal rival of God.

47. Constant familiarity with evil appears to have told by degrees on the angelic character of Satan the accuser. He becomes unnaturally suspicious, not only willing but eager to accuse, at times even a slanderer; and as such he is re-

buked when offering to become the adversary of Joshua the High Priest, "The Lord rebuke thee, Satan" (Zech. iii. 2).

48. The terror of this accusing angel fairly took possession of the Jewish mind. The people imagined him constantly reporting them to God, lying about them and slandering them, and even inciting them to evil for the sake of getting them chastised. When it comes to this it is plain that a great change is passing over Satan, instead of finding out, and punishing and suppressing evil, he becomes its aider and abettor, a kind of marplot, or diabolus, and as he grows in importance and power he begins to measure his strength with Jehovah Himself. This was the state of Jewish belief about 588 B.C. The Jews now for a space of seventy years were closely associated with Persia. They found the Osmuzd and the Ahriman, the good and evil spirits, dividing between them the Divine sovereignty, and they naturally enough adopted just so much of this dualism as could possibly be fitted into their monotheistic religion. They still worshipped one God, Jehovah, but they elevated Satan into something like an Ahriman,

and made him, once for all, not only the accuser, and slanderer, and tempter of man, but the satan or adversary of God Himself; yet it is not until after the close of the Old Testament that we find Satan invested with his full powers of satanic royalty. In the apocryphal books you will find frequent allusions to all sorts of assistant devils, and between the last book of the Old and the first book of the New Testament there grew up the complete fabric of demonology, the crowned Devil, and all his angels, as we find him in the popular theology of the Jews about the time of Christ.

49. See then how well defined is the growth of this belief. Step by step the Devil can be historically traced from his origin in Jehovah Himself. First we relegate to the realm of universal myth, but myth embodying no doubt universal truth, the story of Eve and the serpent. Then we find that Jehovah did both good and evil in the early theology of the Jews. A remnant of this belief lingers as late as Isaiah (xlv. 7): "I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things." But as the Jewish conscience expanded, most of

the derogatory functions formerly attributed to Jehovah were handed over to an adversary or an accuser, one of the many celestial ministers, or sons of God, standing in the Heavenly Presence. By degrees the work of sifting men and accusing them began to tell upon Satan, who became at last a slanderer of the brethren; and as he grew in malice and in power he became hated of men, and conceived the idea of rivalling God. When the development of belief had reached that point, we find the Jews coming into contact (long and friendly contact) with the Persians; and as they had borrowed from Egypt and Assyria, so they now naturally borrowed from Persia. They borrowed Ahriman, the bad spirit, or so much of him as they could conveniently fit on to their monotheistic religion, and lo! the satan or accuser of the brethren stepped forth as the Arch-Fiend, rivalling Jehovah Himself in the number and activity of his subjects, and disputing with Him even the range of His influence. The Apocrypha roughly fills the space between Malachi, the last of the prophets, and the Advent of Christ; and in this memorable 400 years, during which the Devil and all his angels seemed to the Jews to be let

loose upon them in their contest under the Maccabees with Antiochus and Nicanor, and afterwards with the Romans, both the figure of the conquering Messiah and of His satanic rival acquired solidity, so that when Christ appeared the stage was already prepared, in the popular imagination, for the final struggle between the powers of good and evil, and the final triumph of good over evil, so eloquently set forth in the Apocalypse. "There was war in heaven, Michael and his angels fought against the Dragon, and the Dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; and the great Dragon was cast out, that old serpent (*sic*), that deceiveth the whole world, he was cast out into the earth." But this was only the prelude to the final victory by the Word of God; the "Faithful and True" on the white horse over Death and Hell. "The Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone," "and Death and Hell were cast into the lake of fire."

50. If then we take our account from the Bible instead of from Milton, we shall find that Satan fell *not* before the Creation, as in "Paradise

Lost," but only after the appearance of Christ on earth, and directly in consequence of the spread of His kingdom, when evil vanishes as the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ. And figuratively this is much the truest account.

51. We now come to Christ and the New Testament. Did Christ believe in the Arch-Fiend? We find ourselves face to face with the account of Christ's temptation by the Devil, when He was led into the wilderness, then placed on a pinnacle of the Temple, and lastly taken up into a high mountain and shown the kingdoms of the earth. First, I note that here as elsewhere we do not profess to have a narrative by Jesus Christ Himself, but something which some one else narrates about Him. Secondly, the elements of the Gospels are very compound; fragments of discourse, fragments of narrative, and fragments of spiritual allegory. The temptation of Christ seems to me to belong to the last, and as even orthodox commentators allow us to hold that the story is an edifying allegory, setting forth the victory of good over evil in the ideal Man Christ Jesus, I shall not assume that any

teaching of Christ about the Arch-Fiend is here registered.

52. But when Christ said, "If I by Beelzebub, the prince of devils, cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?" is not this an acknowledgment of the personality of the Devil? Perhaps He was answering fools according to their folly. Let us see. A person comes to me and says, "I saw the ghost of William III.," and I, not at all believing in ghosts, reply, "Well, supposing you saw a ghost, how do you know it was the ghost of William III.?" would you say that I thereby pledged myself to a belief in ghosts? Of course you would not. If the Jews say to Christ, "You cast out devils by Beelzebub," and Christ says, "*If* I by Beelzebub cast out devils," it does not on the face of it commit Christ to the belief in Beelzebub, any more than my reply would commit me to a belief in ghosts, whatever my opinion might be. That Christ believed in evil spirits there can be no doubt, but the Arch-Fiend is here the point.

53. Observe further the consistent way in

which Jesus used all the forms of speech He found about Him, and used all the doctrines of the Jews, infusing into them a higher meaning, but ever choosing words and images familiar to the people, else they would not have been "very attentive to hear Him." "Hell," only as a symbol of spiritual corruption. "Kingdom of God," only a spiritual kingdom, not the one expected by the Jews, "coming with observation," or a show. "Baptism," only not of water merely, but of the Holy Spirit; and so on. Hence His use of the word Satan, instead of being always to be understood as an allusion to an Arch-Fiend, is probably never so, but points rather to the various manifestations of evil, or the presence of many evil influences.

54. Our translators have played fast and loose with the words Satan and Diabolus, sometimes, at their own discretion, rendering it a slanderer, at others the Devil. I will illustrate this. In the parable of the sower we read, "Then cometh the Devil:" why not the "adversary"? And so, for "this woman whom Satan has bound," read, "this woman whom an adversary," not even *the* Satan or *the* adversary,

only an adverse influence. And when Christ turned sharply upon Peter and said, "Get thee behind me, Satan," the words are, "Get thee behind me, slanderer," marplot, trifler with the Divine concerns. So when He tells us the goats are to go into everlasting fire prepared for the "Devil and his angels," just as men are represented symbolically as "goats," so we may fairly argue that the "Devil and his angels" was a current term in the mouth of every Jew, and adopted by Jesus Christ to represent the evil and degrading self-accusing, self-tormenting influences, the worm of self-consciousness that should never die, the spiritual fire that should never be quenched.

55. But the translators have done worse with the apostles than with Christ. For instance (1 Tim. iii. 11), St. Paul warns the wives of deacons not to be "devils;" but then the translators have felt that would not be polite, and so have rendered it "slanderers." They have it right there, for instead of calling the women Satans, they call them slanderers. In Titus ii. 3, St. Paul warns the aged women not to be devils, but there again, as it would not do

to call aged women "devils," the word is rendered "accusers." So you see when there was nothing to prove by it the translators could translate fairly enough, but when there was anything to prove they conjured with words, and twisted and turned "the," "a," or "an," until the pages of the New Testament are fairly haunted with the presence of the Arch-Fiend.

56. I do not wish to overstate the case, or to deny that there are allusions to the orthodox Jewish Devil in the New Testament, but they are not so frequent as has been supposed, they are not always in confirmation of his real existence, and it is doubtful whether in any one case the existence of an Arch-Fiend is endorsed by Christ. Such phrases as "the Prince of this world," "the evil one," "the Devil and his angels," belonging to the stock theology of the Jews, were freely used by Christ; but to what extent literally, and to what extent figuratively, seeing that His reporters themselves were all Jewish, and imbued with Jewish theology, we shall perhaps never be able to determine. On the other hand, it is tolerably certain that the disciples and apostles of Christ, who

remained for the most part Jews, retained the great body of Jewish doctrine on this question and others, such as circumcision, meats offered to idols, abstaining from things strangled, and from blood, &c., merely taking Christianity on as an addition; and to these the doctrine of the Devil was peculiarly acceptable, as it supplied the appropriate pendant to Christ, and after His departure gave by force of contrast great solidarity to the figure of the Messiah.

The powers of good and evil ran naturally into the two personalities. The Son of man and all His holy angels on one side, the Devil and his angels on the other, made up the striking picture which the Jewish Christian delighted to contemplate, in the firm belief that the final overthrow of evil was close at hand, and that presently the Devil and his own would be cast into the lake of fire, and then the kingdoms of the world would become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ, over which He would reign for ever and ever.

57. After the death of Nero (the Beast of Revelation xiii. 18) the Devil was not cast into

the burning lake, nor did the Jewish Christians win the day, but in A.D. 70 they were miserably dispersed, and their Temple burned, and their city razed to the ground. Neither did Christ reappear to confound the Roman Empire, which settled down again comfortably enough under the Flavians, but the Devil survived, and became an important foil to the resplendent figure of Christ all through the Middle Ages.

Justin Martyr calls him the "Ape of God," and Tertullian represents him as parodying all the sacraments of the Church.

Taking a hint from the Jews, the Christians attributed to him plagues, famines, and all kinds of misfortunes.

The Devil and Hell were the all-absorbing topics of the mediæval theology. In the striking conceptions of Dante and Michael Angelo we must all have noticed how far more vivid are the devilish than the celestial images. Heaven is tame and vapid to the excitement of hell, and it is quite clear which appealed most to the artist's imagination, and which he practically took most delight in painting.

The west front of Amiens Cathedral, showing in bas-relief the last Judgment, is a good example

of this. The occupations of the devils in devising torments for the damned are, to judge from their faces, both varied and delightful, whilst the saints seem to have a most melancholy and monotonous time of it in heaven.

58. But the strangest thing of all was what I may call the popular Devil theology of the Early Church, in which we find the Devil bargaining with God on independent terms. The Devil surrenders man, who, by disobedience, had become his rightful spoil, and in return Jesus is handed over to Satan; but it appears the transaction is not *bonâ fide*, for the Devil finds it impossible to keep Jesus, and is, in fact, cheated, to the exquisite delight of the good Fathers of the Church. In short, they point out that the Arch-Enemy swallowed the bait (the humanity of Christ) and was caught by the hook (the Divinity of Christ), and was only too glad to let both go.

59. This somewhat, to us, profane and immoral "scheme" of salvation lasted from the fourth century well into the Middle Ages, until it was superseded by the still more shocking and

thoroughly Jewish notion that Christ's death rescued man, not from the Devil so much as from the fury of God.

We find the oddest development of these and similar doctrines in the Miracle-plays of the thirteenth and following centuries. At one time Satan brings an action against "a certain Jesus by name, Son of Joseph and Mary," who has plundered him of his infernal universe.

At other times Jesus is Judge, and the action is brought against man. Mary pleads for him, but it is ruled that she is too nearly related to the Judge.

It seems generally admitted that the Devil is technically right, but man is protected by the mercy of God, which takes the form of outwitting and cheating the Devil. The "Devil's Lawsuit," by Jacobus de Theramo, a lawyer (fourteenth century), gives an excellent idea of a "scheme of salvation" which has (owing to its incisive simplicity) unhappily outlasted the Middle Ages, and dimmed the lustre of many an eloquent pulpit since.

60. The frequent and familiar appearance of Satan on the popular stage bred the inevitable

contempt. He soon became little better than the buffoon of the period, and, as such, the most popular actor with the common people. The light allusions to old Nick and old Bogie prevalent in our own day are doubtless Middle Age relics.

61. The earliest known picture of Satan in human form is found on an ivory diptych of the time of Charles the Bold (ninth century), but there was not a holy man who had not seen him or heard him, and many pious monks had had regular encounters with him. The blessed Richalmus, a French Abbot of the thirteenth century, was very intimate with him and his satellites. They made the saint cough, gave him toothache, took away his appetite, clucked like hens, and hated to see him reading Gregory's "Morals." He heard one devil say to the other, "Ah! I saw him reading the 'Morals' again, and I don't feel well."

62. By degrees, as it appeared that Satan was constantly worsted by the holy men, he lost his character for cleverness, and fell into general disrepute as a formidable power. The wild and

fanatical outburst against witches in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was the last and lowest form of tribute to the influence of the Arch-Fiend; and when before the light of the Reformation, the revival of learning, and the creation of science, this too died away, Satan was well-nigh shorn of all his old dignity, until rehabilitated by the genius of Milton.

63. The fallen angel of the "Paradise Lost," strong, terrible, and sublimely defiant, was modelled upon what we may call the classic period of Satan, when, equipped with many of the attributes of the Persian Ahriman, and attended by a hell-full of demons, he stepped forth to do battle with his deadly and victorious rival, the Son of God.

Few readers are aware how little they derive their notions about the Devil from their Bibles, and how much from the theology made popular and ingrained in the English mind by the "Paradise Lost," of which they individually may never have read a line.

64. In conclusion, my dear friends, let me say that while I think it would be extremely difficult for us, as reasonable men and women in

the nineteenth century, to attribute any great importance to the personality of the Arch-Fiend, I think we shall do well to remember that we live in a world of mystery, and that what is seen is probably but an infinitesimal portion of what is not seen, but of what at any moment may be revealed here or hereafter. Therefore we deny nothing.

To me it is infinitely less reasonable to believe that human beings on this little speck of earth, in this little span of time, are the only intelligent and spiritual beings in the universe, than to believe exactly the reverse.

If there exist other spirits unseen, they may be good and bad.

If they exist they are personal, and therefore have that quality at least in common with us.

If they have something in common with us there may be ways and means of intercommunication through brain-waves, promoted by the electrical vibration of the nerve fluids. All this seems to me at least as possible as that my ear should receive air-waves, corresponding to thought, or that my eye should receive light-waves, corresponding to colours.

I see, then, no bar of reason to the entry of

good and bad spiritual influences into the soul from without, but I hope the bad are organised under no king. One only is my Master, King of kings, and Lord of lords.

Let me go on believing that all outside His kingdom is chaos, without coherence, or harmony, or order, which is itself a Divine thing. If Satan be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand?

Let me believe in the Divine irony of those words; let me believe that he is divided against himself, and that he cannot stand.

Do I not feel that it is so within me?

There is no harmony, no consistency in the evil passions, in the disordered and ill-regulated impulse, in the legion of devils. They tear each other in the slime, they have no king. The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. The heart is the Lord's. Sin has no kingdom, no home; but evil is a parasite, and we may be tempted by spirits in the body, and out of the body; and often, whether in the body we know not, or out of the body we know not—God knoweth.

65. I see nothing at all irrational in our being

communicated with spiritually, and being urged on in one direction; it may be even that certain physical states or morbid states of ill-health, may be peculiarly propitious to the entering in of bad influences, while other states may be favourable, in our imperfect condition, to the entering in of good spiritual influences.

Do you not know that you are dependent on the body, in ways sometimes humiliating, sometimes exalting; but don't you see that whether it is so or not it does not signify? it does not matter whether the influences be physical, mental, or spiritual, that tempt us, or whether they be personal or impersonal, so long as they are recognised as *real*, and the relations of the *ego*, the *I*, to them be understood.

When an overpowering impulse comes upon you in private, or in the busy crowd when a thought flashes across the mind, or in the depths of speculation when a questionable scheme appears before you with an almost irresistible impulse to entertain it, it does not signify whether it is the Devil or devils, or the working of your own mind, but it does signify what attention or attitude of mind you present to it.

You were not responsible for your thoughts and desires; but you are responsible for the way in which you treat your thoughts and your desires.

The secret of all true life is the habit of attending to the right things and neglecting the wrong ones.

66. The doctrine that you are tempted by devils is morally irrelevant, one way or the other. Suggestions, impulses, thoughts, desires, may come from the right or the left, *they* do not constitute *you*. *You* sit and judge between them. This sovereignty is claimed by conscience and the will. Nothing but lunacy can make you a mere puppet.

To all intents and purposes the will is free, and conscience is arbiter amidst any number of conflicting forces, material and spiritual. You meet bad men and women in the world: you are not obliged to select them as your companions, as a rule you can get away from them; and as a rule you can get away from other devils.

67. Within you are the higher voices, drown-

ing the voice of the tempter; without you is the Christ; and before you have moved a multitude whom no man can number, clad in white robes, and beckoning you onward.

Be comforted, when you remember that you are not alone; take your place in the great caravan of the ages, and feel that you are one with those that are toiling and those whose toil is done, until across the desert sands the morning breaks, and the bright City and Home of God shines out. For yé are not come unto the Mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest; but ye are come unto Mount Sion, unto the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect.

CRIME.

CRIME.

68. Subject.
69. One-sided Sympathy.
70. Class against Class.
71. What is done to cure Criminals?
72. John Howard.
73. His Early Life.
74. Wife and Child.
75. Sheriff of Bedford.
76. State of the English Prisons.
77. York and Ely.
78. Out of Sight, out of Mind.
79. Every one responsible.
80. Howard's Method.
81. Howard's First Principle.
82. Howard's Second Principle.
83. Howard's Third Principle
84. Howard's Fourth Principle.
85. Howard's Fifth Principle.
86. Howard's Sixth Principle.
87. Compulsory Education of Children.
88. Compulsory Work.
89. What has been done for Children?
90. Our Street Arabs.
91. Rob Roy on the Arab.
92. Organise.
93. We Treat Children as Criminals.
94. The Case put.
95. Real Cases.
96. Case from the Gaol Cradle.
97. The School-Board not the Police-Court.
98. Deterrent Influences.
99. Causes of adult Crime.
100. The Objects of Punishment.
101. Hanging.
102. Its uncertainty.
103. Why it fails to deter.
104. Practical Results at Liverpool.
105. Flogging.
106. A Word to Parents.
107. Garotting and Flogging.
108. Crank and Treadmill.
109. The prisoner should profit by his Labour.
110. Arguments against productive Prison Work.
111. Discharged Prisoners.
112. Are Prisons too Comfortable?
113. Evil of Repeated Short Sentences.
114. Cumulative Punishment.
115. Separate System.
116. Can Criminals be Reformed?
117. Power of Love.
118. Appeal to Experience.
119. Power of Forgiveness.
120. The Patience of Jesus and Man's Impatience.

III.

CRIME.

I HAVE undertaken to address you on the subject of crime. Crime; its cause and cure. So vast a subject can only be treated in outline, but I wish that outline to bear practically upon you at all points. If the cause of crime must often be beyond your reach, the cure will often be within your reach.

69. At the outset then I will say, to cure crime you must change your attitude towards the criminal classes. People pity the lower criminal classes, but they have little pity for the man who cleverly picks a lock, or plans the robbery of your jewels, or cuts a valuable picture out

of its frame, or slides in amongst good company and steals the spoons.

But the leading members of the thief's profession have risen from the ranks, remember that. Probably they too are the children of thieves, they came into the world weighted with bad tendencies, and were trained by bad example; all which you admit in the case of the lower thief, but it is true of the others as a class for whom you have so little pity.

Realise well the rock from which the criminal classes, high and low, are hewn, and your heart will melt, your eyes will be open, and you will see and feel how you should act towards them.

70. At present society is ranged against society in opposite camps. We look upon the criminal class as a class to be stamped out, and so we catch it, and shut it up, and when we have shut it up we don't think anything more about it till it escapes from our treatment, rather worse than before, and presses itself upon us again.

But criminals have been submitted to temptations from which you and I are free, and when they have committed crime we ought to

think for them, and act for them wisely. When a man gets into prison you become your brother's and your sister's keeper, and when he comes out he comes out with your mark upon him, for good or for evil.

71. The unsympathetic and unchristian rage against the criminal classes is both blind and unpractical; it stops short of improvement, it prevents cure.

Think how little is done to prevent crime, yet it is the shortest and most economical way of abolishing criminals. But sometimes you cannot prevent crime. Agreed; but think when crime has been committed how little is done to reform the criminal. The remedy we apply, our prison discipline, is in many cases worse than the disease.

Prisons used to be the very hotbeds of physical disease; they are still, in too many instances, the hotbeds of moral disease.

72. The person who first called public attention to the treatment of the criminal classes was JOHN HOWARD, the well-known philanthropist (born 1726, died 1790); and it is not too much

to say that the germ of almost every moral and sanitary reform in the state of the people that has since taken place is to be found in some hint, plan, or practice advocated by John Howard.

Let us pay on the threshold of our subject a passing tribute of memory to this great and singular man.

73. John Howard, the son of a small tradesman, was born at Hackney in the year 1726. He was himself trained to business habits in a grocer's shop, but at his father's death came in to property and lived on his estate.

He was a lonely and self-centred man, with narrow though deep affections, an utter disregard of conventional opinion, an absolute belief in his own, and filled with a severe sense of duty, together with a power of concentration which sustained and coloured the whole of his life-work.

Having fallen sick in lodgings, he was tended by an excellent widow woman who kept the house. She was twice his age, of no personal attractions, and a settled invalid, yet Howard insisted upon marrying her out of gratitude; nor did he ever repent of his choice.

In three years he was a widower, and his health being re-established he determined to go abroad. He sailed in 1755.

All England was then ringing with the news of the earthquake at Lisbon. He had plans for relieving the sufferers, and resolved to visit the scene of disaster in person; but his ship fell into the hands of a French privateer. He was captured, and thrust into a noisome dungeon. There he was first made acquainted with the horrors of a French prison.

On escaping to England, he carried with him impressions that grew deeper with every year of his life, and although fourteen years passed before he lighted upon his wonderful career, he was not idle, but, marrying again in 1758, settled down upon his estates at Cardington, near Bedford, and spent his time and money in building model cottages and schools for his tenantry, and in studying medicine.

74. In his philanthropic method he was at least a hundred years in advance of his age, and we have done little more since than follow tardily in his footsteps.

In 1765 his second wife died suddenly, and

his affections, narrow but deep as they were, never recovered from the blow. He never forgot her, and carried her miniature into all the dungeons in Europe.

His only child, a son, seems to have been a source of unmixed anxiety and trouble to him; and the lad doubtless came into the world, unfortunately, weighted with the eccentricity but without any of the great qualities of his father. Howard never understood him, and in attempting to drive him into the groove of the narrowest religious training, he is said to have exercised undue and ill-judged severity. His unfortunate ambition was to train his son to complete self-sacrifice, which ended in the lad's being initiated, by an abandoned hypocritical though trusted valet, into all the worst vices, and ending his life in a Lunatic Asylum. This result of the narrowest form of Bible-piety cannot be too much noted and deplored.

75. On returning from his second tour on the Continent he dedicated himself solemnly to the service of God, and entered, as sheriff of Bedford, upon the peculiar sphere which has made his name so famous. He never flinched from

his unpleasant duties; he was constant at the scaffold, sat in the courts, and visited every cell in the gaols of his county.

Bedford gaol thus became twice immortal. John Bunyan in 1672 issued his "Pilgrim's Progress" from his saint's rest there; and John Howard in 1773 passed from its walls to make no ideal "Pilgrim's Progress" throughout the prison houses of the civilised world.

76. What was the state of those prisons? What was the fate of those prisoners?

Noisome cells, months of unjust imprisonment before trial, innocent persons arraigned and fined without redress, and no less than two hundred crimes punishable with death.

The gaolers were the lowest of the people, chosen for their brutal insensibility to human suffering; and the prison officials robbed and tortured the prisoners almost at discretion.

There was no regard to health or decency, and a horrible disease, known as gaol-fever, decimated the prison population.

Warwick, Worcester, Gloucester, Oxford, each fresh gaol swells the black catalogue of horrors. Little straw, bad water, rotten walls, men and

women huddled together, intramural dunghills, stagnant mire, drunken orgies, unsalaried keepers, debtors without food; all this is set down drily and systematically, but with a horrible and cumulative force which at last fairly roused the country.

77. Howard arrived at York, where things were a little better, but in this model gaol he found that three human beings were commonly locked up for nights of fourteen to seventeen hours long in winter, in cells 7½ feet long, 6½ feet wide, 8½ feet high, with only a hole of 4 × 8 inches over the door to admit the poisoned air of a dark and damp passage-way.

At Ely, the prison being insecure, prisoners were laid on their backs at night, caged by iron bars crossed over their bodies, while iron collars full of spikes prevented any motion of their heads. Such was the state of things in 1773.

78. But all these things were out of sight, and out of mind. How many abuses are out of sight and out of mind now? How are people to be roused? By facts. We want to produce before you facts and principles of action this day,

such as Howard produced in his day, that will enable you to take part in the great impending reform and rearrangement of our prisons and criminals. Until public feeling is once more interested, and the public rightly informed, nothing can be done. Pauperism, drunkenness, crime, and criminals, are left alone, because never systematically thought of or understood. Until this is done no bill can pass. Parliament attends to nothing but public feeling. Your enlightened Christian assemblies have to create that public feeling. A man coming into Parliament, and wanting a reform, can do nothing, because Parliament is not ripe for it. Nobody knows anything about the subject for which he is fighting.

You must rouse the Press, but the Press won't treat subjects until you will read about them. It must be assured that you take an interest in the subject before it ventures to publish.

You must rouse the Pulpit. The clergy must speak out, they must show the moral importance of great reforms. You must learn to feel strongly about them; then the Press will move, and Parliament will move, and we shall get something done.

79. You then have it in your power to hasten reform by fifty or a hundred years. Each one of you must see to these great questions, and must influence others, and help the Government to undertake, amongst other things, the reform of the prison code and of criminals.

80. It is Howard's glory that he began this reform. After exhausting England, he overran the whole of Europe, spent thousands of pounds, travelled thousands of miles in amassing observation and statistics, which at last appeared in his famous work, "On the State of Prisons in England and Wales."

By this time Mr. Popham, Member for Taunton, and Mr. Whitbread had roused the House to a sense of the importance of prison reform, and when Howard was called to the bar of the House of Commons, the impression he produced was overwhelming. He swept the whole field. His accuracy, his minute and exhaustive knowledge, his intense though calm and practical zeal, supplied a foundation upon which the Government could rely, and which outside the House set the whole of England on fire.

It is our business to carry on this great work.

81. Now John Howard came to certain great conclusions about the criminal classes, and the way in which they ought to be treated, and his statements have never been surpassed for clearness and thoroughness. We are slowly learning to understand them now. What are they, briefly?

Firstly, if you want to put down crime you must catch the children. You must train the rising generation, and prevent them from becoming criminals. The object of the police is to discover, not to prevent crime; but prevention is better than detection, and therefore our object should be to catch and take care of the little children, and experience teaches us that only 4 per cent. of persons who have been decently educated and brought up ever become criminals. That fact speaks volumes in face of the nonsense that is talked about education training clever criminals, and failing to elevate, morally and socially.

When all are educated, criminals will be educated too; but their number will be ever

in a diminishing ratio. Their existence itself may be due to our imperfect system of education. The 4 per cent. will dwindle as religious influences are brought to leaven knowledge.

Oh, the importance of the little children, the fresh young minds, the tender little hearts! What does Christ say? "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not," and He launches a terrible curse against those who put stumbling-blocks in the way, and offend one of these little ones.

Yet what are we doing? If we are not actually putting stumbling-blocks in their way, we are doing little enough to remove their unfavourable conditions, and to move society to take care of them.

At last, as it were but yesterday, we have got compulsory education, a few industrial schools, a Factory Act, an hospital; but a vast floating population of street Arabs, nomads of the city wilderness, waifs and strays of diseased and dissolute parents, never come under our philanthropic protection until the law pounces upon them as criminals or paupers. Well train the young, that is John Howard's first great principle.

82. The second great principle is prison labour, as a means of the prisoner's improvement and self-support. The labour must not be merely penal but productive.

Teach men how to work, and teach them to love work. John Howard learned this from the Dutch prisons. He found almost every Continental nation in advance of us in the use of labour as a reformatory element in prisons. *Productive and remedial prison labour*, that is the second principle.

83. Third great principle, graduate the punishments more carefully. Don't let us have such a brutal code as shall allot the gallows straight off to over two hundred crimes. Make punishments cumulative when they are not effective, but avoid life-sentences, which cut off hope and bring despair. Graduate punishment.

84. Fourthly, encourage sobriety and amendment by discharging improved and teachable prisoners before the expiration of their term; and make them fond of their work, by giving them a portion of their own industry. Encourage improvement.

85. Fifthly, the use of moral and religious instruction.

86. And the sixth principle, which stretches over the whole field, is the law of kindness, for we come back to the gospel at last. Love should permeate our dealings with the criminal classes. John Howard says, Believe in the transforming power of sympathy and kindness. And Mr. Matthew Davenport Hill, after a long life on the judicial bench, was more than ever persuaded of the irresistible nature of this same law of kindness, as being powerful so far in excess of every deterrent punishment. It seemed to pierce through a man, instead of merely irritating the surface. If you could only discover for him that he was not altogether such a villain, you would reconcile him to himself and to society, he would soon see that you his guardian were not bitter and cruel, that you taught him to work and love work for his own good, and taught him human kindness, by being kind to him. He might not have met with this spirit for years, perhaps never, but he would never forget it. "Some one cares how I live and how I die." That is perhaps

the sweetest and the deepest thought a man or woman can have. The happiest results are to be got from infusing into the criminal the conviction that you mean him well, that you are giving him an opportunity of recuperating his moral nature, and that when you send him forth you won't send him forth like a scapegoat into the wilderness, but like a strong man armed, morally and physically, to fight his enemies within and without.

87. Such are the leading thoughts which John Howard developed in the course of a long life of unceasing vigilance, philanthropy, and toil. I will dwell upon each of these propositions somewhat more at length.

Well, we have made strides since the days of Howard. We have got compulsory education —a great blessing throughout the land. People talk about the dangers of education, and tell us we only make more clever criminals, but I have shown the absurdity of this.

All the education in the world won't stamp out all evil and all sin; but if a man goes wrong if he is well taught, it is not in consequence of his knowing better, but it is in spite of his know-

ing better. Therefore I say, "First educate the children!" What I mean by education is not merely teaching them a certain amount of reading, writing, and arithmetic, but drawing out their characters, drawing out and developing what God has implanted in them — training faculties and dispositions. The task of education is one which brings a real master or mistress constantly across all points of moral and mental culture. Take a child to school, and you open out for him all good and righteous influences.

What might not the teacher be to him, and do for him! Let the master speak kindly to the boy, put his hand on the boy's shoulder and look into his eyes affectionately, and a little earnest watchfulness, a firm hand, a gentle word, will bind that boy with golden chains to the master.

Schoolmasters and mistresses all over the land, what a charge is yours!

Do you know what you may be to the world by possessing the lives of your children, by winning their hearts?

You implant in them feelings, and thoughts, and habits, that for good or evil they will carry

with them to their graves. Through them you already dominate their children.

The future of England, the prosperity, the health, the religion, the happiness of our people yet unborn, is in the hands of those who teach and train the young.

88. Secondly, I would have compulsory work. The British love of what is called freedom rises up against that. But what I ask is that the Government, or society in some shape or other, should watch over and care for the child when his school teaching is done.

As it is insisted that he shall be educated up to a very moderate age, so we should insist that his education be not thrown away—that he should be prepared for labour. Just as we have great Board Schools, so we want great Elementary Schools of Labour, an extension of the Industrial Schools, to take those children who are fresh from school, and teach them how to work.

I would make this compulsory, and I would imitate the Jewish wisdom, and insist upon the young, as far as possible, being taught some useful trade; and I would put them just as

much under State supervision as we have put the Board Schools.

The best part of education is to teach the child how to make his education practical.

As John Howard said, "Make them diligent, and you will make them honest."

I would like to see these great Elementary Schools of Labour all over the land. To set up these might require capital, raised possibly by a rate, but even that would pay, for we should soon empty the prisons and workhouses.

By spending a little more on education, and a little less on Reformatories and Unions, we should exterminate the class for which these oppressive drains on the public money exist.

89. And here you must not suppose that I speak in ignorance of, or unthankfulness for, what has been done for children. Young criminals are provided for by the Reformatory Acts. Wandering children are cared for under the Local Government Act. Children of outdoor paupers can be educated under Denison's Act. Children of the wage-earning poor will be sent to school under the Education Act. Children in factories or workshops come under the Factory Act and

the Workshop Acts. Children working as street shoeblacks or messengers are specially regulated by the Street Traffic Act. Orphans, idiots, blind, cripples, foundlings, and deaf, have all special Asylums. (See "Ten Thousand Street Folk," by Rob Roy.) All this has been done, and yet there is room; and were any proof wanting of this, it is that "Rob Roy," in a paper read at a meeting of the Charity Organisation Society (Nov. 21, 1872), computed that there are about 10,000 young persons employed in match and newspaper selling, &c., about the London streets, who are still unprotected by law—without discipline or education, with no combination, public body, or voluntary agency to secure them from a life of beggary or worse.

90. Then how would I deal with these, our street Arabs? Of these street Arabs at least 4,000 are *bonâ fide* children in the streets of London. They have no particular home; they are not vagabonds, they are working bees. They pick up a livelihood by selling newspapers and match-boxes, flowers, or anything they can get you to buy; and if they cannot get you to buy, they will just as soon pick your pocket, or steal

your umbrella. If ever there was a public question, this is one. It is a question for you.

Any one who has any influence in the vestry of Marylebone, for instance, should turn his attention to this question. The first thing is to reduce this population to facts and figures.

Collect all these waifs and strays, and organise their labour. I don't want to suppress them. The policeman is always moving them on, because they have no settled place. I should like to see them in places where they could not be moved on; at kiosks or stalls fixed and appointed by the parishes. Then they would not only be useful to the neighbourhood, but we should be able to bring some influence to bear on these little waifs and strays.

91. Something has been done here. The Shoeblack Brigade helps to some small extent. The street-sweepers are organised, and at night there are a few homes like the "Newsboy's Home" in Gray's Inn Lane. But, as "Rob Roy" says, "What can we effect if we drill a mob at night who were a mob all day and will be a mob to-morrow?" You must know where to find them by day as well as by night

if you want to educate, improve, or even keep them out of the criminal classes.

92. I say, then, let each parish organise its street Arabs. They are worth it. Ask Lord Shaftesbury what he thinks of the raw material of the streets. He will tell you that it is not so black as it is painted, that the rocks upon which these poor children have foundered are bad conditions. Whereas the children of the upper and middle classes have had favourable conditions, these little waifs and strays have been thrown into the streets at a tender age to shift for themselves. What can become of them? Suppose they steal, whose fault is it? Who taught them better? When do they first come under discipline? Often in a police court. And what a discipline for a child no worse, perhaps, than your child!

93. There are 28,000 children (see the "Gaol Cradle") appear annually as "prisoners at the bar." This is a most dreadful thought to me. I think we are quite wrong in our treatment of these little ones. We treat them like criminals.

We ought not to call any children criminals.

How can they be? They are the victims of bad example. In their infancy their characters are formed for good or evil. *You* have to form them.

94. A little child on some cold night takes a hot potato. He steals one when he is hungry, and the policeman is down upon him, and treats the poor little creature as a thief. At all events he is put into the van with drunkards and thieves, lodged in a felon's cell, and taken before the magistrate for seizing this potato. Perhaps he never even knew that it was wrong.

Well, he is sent to prison. What a dreadful thing is that for a child of nine or ten years of age! 28,000 children are annually taken before our magistrates and locked up like common criminals!

I declare that is not the right treatment for them.

You rivet upon the child's mind vile associations.

You cast a stigma upon its life which it will never afterwards shake off. Worst of all, when it comes out it will perhaps be proud of having been in prison. Such things are. But I say

as good Mr. Kindersley, the magistrate for Birmingham, says, that it is heart-breaking to "see a little child of seven years old cowering in the corner of a dark police cell, sucking its thumb, and crying for its mammy!" It is a disgrace to the common sense and decent feeling of England, and it is enough to break the heart of any Christian man. Just think for a moment how the fatal crime-hardening process is begun, and you will see that the danger and injustice of these committals are often as gross as they are pitiful.

95. The Howard Association Report of 1875 tells of a child of eight years sent to prison for petty theft.

Another boy of seven years sent to prison for injuring a sixpenny lock.

A child of seven years imprisoned for three months for stealing fourpence and some sugar-plums at Worthing.

At Jersey a girl of thirteen, in February, 1875, was locked up in a stone cell for receiving a pat of stolen butter. Afterwards it turned out she did not know it was stolen. The air being chill, and the floor frozen, and the food bread and

water, the poor child pined away and died in a fortnight. A local jury returned, "Death from natural causes," and might have added, "but *unnatural* treatment."

96. Many causes from which well-to-do children are free may drive a poor child to steal in the streets.

A terrible story I read the other day in a book (see the "Gaol Cradle"), and it is well authenticated. A boy, eight years old, lived with his mother, to whom he was devoted. The poor woman worked as long as she could, until she was laid down with cancer. In the midst of her trouble and suffering she had that dreadful hunger which belongs to cancer. You cannot feed cancer enough. The poor woman craved for food, but there was nothing left.

At last the poor little fellow went out into the streets to beg for his dying mother.

It was the first time he had ever begged.

The policeman was soon down upon him, and handed him over to the magistrate, who gave him a month.

When he came out of prison, he naturally rushed to see his mother. She was dead. He

was met by the woman of the house, who said, "Oh, you little gaol-bird, go into the streets, I won't have any thieves and beggars here."

And that poor little urchin was driven from door to door, and down, down, until he became a confirmed criminal. That is the way in which numbers of children are saddled with crime by the agency set up to check crime.

97. I repeat that the police court is not the place for children. If a policeman gets hold of them, as is natural enough, he should not be empowered to take them before a tribunal to be dealt with as criminals.

What is the remedy? We have it in our own hands. It is in the School Board, or the National School Committee in each district; but the School Boards supply numerous centres in which you could successfully deal with almost all these poor little juvenile criminals. Instead of sending them to the magistrate, send them to the schoolmaster. Let the policeman take them to some one who will teach them better; not, as now, to *a place for the manufacture of criminals.*

Let the School Committee assist the master

with its judicial wisdom, and let the schoolmaster deal with the criminals, and give them advice, instruction, or a good whipping, if necessary.

98. I am not in favour of incessant whipping amongst rich or poor, but it is merciful sometimes, though it is better to enlighten and persuade without it if you can. Still, all public justice is a rule of the rough-and-ready sort, and I do think that the association between moral evil and pain is wholesome, as it is certainly Divine.

Deterrent influences are not good for nothing, but for the reformation of children the police court is worse than good for nothing.

I say we are making more criminals by the action of our police courts upon the young than we are saving men or protecting society. Change your policy, and try the machinery ready to your hand. The use of the School Boards is to teach the poor child, and it may teach one who has begun to go wrong what he is to avoid, without casting a stigma upon him which will drag him down till he becomes one of the dangerous classes.

99. In passing to adult crime, one glance at its causes will make us more merciful, and, I trust, more wise.

Drunkenness, hereditary, or induced by the pressure of want. Exhaustion and disappointment. Pauperism, hereditary, or induced by disease or drunkenness. Over-crowded rookeries and low lodging-houses, where every feeling of comfort and decency is soon extinguished. Want of labour, ignorance of where to seek it or how to secure it. A bad harvest, a depression in trade, an epidemic, death of the bread-winner, protracted sickness, ignorance, strikes, and the evil counsels of half-instructed agitators. The mistakes of honest men. The wear and tear of a struggle in which employers and employed are trying the solution of problems not yet solved. Unwise or inadequate legislation. The administration of "Justice's justice;" and a hundred other direct and indirect causes, thrust men and women and children, tottering on the verge, over into the abyss of crime.

100. And what is our remedy?

Punishment. And what are the special objects punishment is to accomplish?

We punish people first, perhaps, as a natural expression of righteous indignation.

Then we punish them in order to protect society.

Then we punish them to deter others from committing crimes.

"You are not hanged," said the judge as he put on the black cap, "because you have committed murder, but that murder may not be committed."

And lastly (which should perhaps come first) we punish the criminal in order to reform him. Of all these causes for giving punishment, the two last really include the others.

We punish in order to deter others and to reform the criminal, but if you do deter others, and if you reform the criminal, you protect society, and at the same time your righteous indignation is expressed; only it is expressed and also tempered with mercy, by carrying along with it the Divine principle of individual reformation, as a means to social regeneration.

101. First, then, with reference to deterrent punishment, I ask, how far is hanging really deterrent? Formerly we used to hang for

two hundred offences: it was not found to deter people.

This is a vexed question, I know, and I cannot treat it exhaustively in this place, but my belief is, on the whole, that hanging is a failure.

You cannot say that it reforms the criminal, because of course it does not. You simply take him away and kill him, which is like curing a man's toothache by cutting his head off. You hang a person, and there is an end of him as far as you are concerned.

102. But it is tolerably clear that hanging is not adequately deterrent. The first element in a deterrent punishment is its certainty.

Hanging is the most uncertain of punishments. Thirty per cent. only of accused murderers are convicted, and a much smaller ratio are hanged.

In 1868, out of 21 condemned, only 12 were hanged. In 1872, out of 30, only 15; and in 1871, out of 13, only 4 were hanged. Inference, if you commit a murder, the chances are you will not be hanged.

Juries used to be more indifferent to human

life than they are now, but they are not likely to become less scrupulous, and therefore hanging is not now likely to be more certain. It proved however at best so poor a deterrent that when it was certain and constant it did not deter.

104. There is another reason why it fails which I have never seen pointed out. It is this, that amongst the lower orders, especially amongst the unbalanced kind of minds, criminal or non-criminal, you cannot get people to realise anything beyond the present. The vague possibility is to them the non-existent as a motive of action.

A future uncertain punishment is only realised by the more reflecting mind; it appeals to the imagination and the intellect. You and I may realise these things much better than the people for whom they were invented.

Look at the popular belief in everlasting punishment. See what little effect it has upon any of you who may still believe in it. How often does it deter you from doing what you feel inclined to do because it happens to be wrong? No, you will risk it, you say. After all, God is merciful, and so the possible future

punishment is not deterrent. It is the same with hanging.

104. Here is a fine practical comment of the dread which the possible scaffold strikes into the breasts of wrong-doers.

Last January, in Liverpool, on one day three men were hanged for murder, and the *Times* expressed a hope that their terrible example might prove a turning-point in the character of the town and county, and administer a decisive check to crimes of violence. A few days later the *Standard* writes: "On the very day that the Liverpool murderers were hanged, two men were charged with robbery with violence, committed in a street close to the scene of the murder, and the same night a ship's cook was stabbed at a street corner." At the following summer assizes the calendar was pronounced to be "*the blackest on record*," there being six cases of murder from Liverpool alone, and more than twenty local commitments for manslaughter or other violent crimes! Therefore it is fair to say hanging has proved a failure; or at all events the facts before us establish the probability that on the whole hanging does not

protect society or deter men from committing murder.

105. *Flogging* is another favourite deterrent. We have heard a great deal about that lately. Adult floggings are certainly brutalising, therefore anti-reformatory. The only other question is whether there are corresponding advantages —whether it deters people from crime. Now the magistrates are almost of one judgment, that if *boys* are very bad a good whipping is a very good thing for them, if it is administered judiciously in connection with other treatment.

Mr. John Rowe, the veteran governor of Plymouth gaol, whilst opposed to adult flogging, states that the birching of young criminals is often a merciful and efficacious substitute for imprisonment.

106. And here let me say a word by the way to parents. The rough and ready methods of public justice are one thing, private training of children another. It is always better to persuade and win your children than to beat them. It is always a sign of *your* inability to use the most powerful instrument for good, if you

cannot make the child better by wisdom and love without flogging it. At times it may be necessary to establish a very sudden and sharp connection between misdeeds and their consequences, a discipline very unpleasant to you and to your child doubtless, but still you may find it necessary by corporal punishment to establish this valuable association of ideas.

There are natures, and there are circumstances, where not to whip may be to "spare the rod and spoil the child;" but whilst I hope that none of you are obliged to resort to such measures, let me warn all children that if they don't learn obedience and self-control, and if they won't mind when they are spoken to, they must be made to mind. What parents and guardians have to do first is this: to teach their children to obey.

There must be some one in the house whom the child will obey, and fear, as well as love. The father is the child's God, and God is the child's Father; and fathers must teach children, as they value their own peace of mind and the souls and bodies of their little ones, to control themselves.

How this is done is of less importance, though

it is important, but if you cannot do it in any other way, it must be done by whipping.

107. This applies to the young, but flogging is always brutal, and probably inefficacious in connection with adults.

I know it is said garotting and crimes of violence were put down by flogging, because they ceased about the time that flogging came in. But on further reflection it will be found that the garotting outbreak had virtually ceased *before* this addition of corporal punishment was adopted, a fact pointed out by one of our judges.

I believe, therefore, that on the whole it is true that adult flogging is a failure. At the same time I speak on this subject under correction, and with great deference to those who may differ from me on adequate grounds.

108. But there is one thing I do abhor and denounce. It is repeated floggings for one offence, at intervals of a week or fortnight. When a poor wretch has received his punishment, to have to look forward to its speedy renewal checks every mental process of reform.

Itsours, crushes, and embitters him. I would punish him if needful, and have done with it, and bring him as speedily as possible under reformatory influences. John Howard has pointed them out. Work. Make your criminals love work; make them feel the dignity and reward of honest labour, even within prison walls.

Abolish the crank and the treadmill, especially where they grind nothing, and are thus purely penal and profitless.

It is a horrible thing to set a man to do unproductive work. People call it penal labour. What is the use of it? It is mere torture. It does no good. It does not reform the prisoner, it does not protect society. Look at the barbarous punishments of China: has crime been suppressed there? Torture alone has never stopped people from wrong-doing.

Experience teaches us to put a man to productive labour, to give him confidence, and train him in habits that will be useful to him when you turn him out.

Surely that is all you want. You don't want to inflict pain on a bad man; that does neither him nor his victims good.

You want to make the bad man good; then he is benefited, and so are you, and so is society, and his good behaviour will be an *amende* far more honourable to society than shins broken on the treadmill, or muscles strained by the crank, ten times over.

109. But I would go further, and give the prisoner some share in the proceeds of his labour.

Let him by industry lay by. If you can manage it, don't let him out of prison till he has acquired a taste for some kind of work.

The productive labour of prisoners lifts the burden off the shoulders of the virtuous citizen on to those of the criminal.

The six State prisons in New England are not only self-supporting, but yielded together in 1871 a surplus of £7,000.

Compare this with the fact that the prisoner in England earns only about £2 per head (Austin Bruce, "Utilisation of Criminal Labour"), and that a gaol population of 17,995 in 1867, instead of adding £7,000 to the nation's wealth, taxed the virtuous citizens to the extent of £657,129!

110. All this, according to some, is entirely the result of our mistaken policy of cruelty, and a disheartening penal code, instead of productive labour and reformatory influences.

America, Belgium, Germany, even India, are in advance of us in their methods, and exhibit results which justify us in learning from them. I am sure that the arguments against productive labour in prisons will not hold water. The adoption of wholesome and productive work in prisons reduces the penal element. Certainly, but it increases the reformatory element, for which the penal exists.

It is difficult to devise. That is a detail of administration, and merely proves the incompetence of those who put it forward.

It can be ill applied to short sentences. I should abolish it for most short sentences, but I should also abolish most short sentences.

It injures the markets, and clogs honest industry. Not if it is properly distributed, the amount of each kind of work produced being then too small to affect the market appreciably; but if it does, why, so does machine labour, so does foreign labour. Besides, if an article is cheapened, every one pays less for it. If wages

are lowered, so are taxes. Such brief and condensed statements are all that can here be made in answer to the opponents of productive labour in prisons, but they are all capable of being argued out at length, and it is right to say that productive labour is now carried on in some English prisons.

111. Then, I ask, what becomes of the criminal when he comes out of prison?

Too often he is thrown upon the world penniless, or almost so. What can he do but return to his haunts and vices? His good tendencies, if he has any, are at once nipped by the frost of hard necessity in the bud.

If whilst in prison he had worked and laid by it would be different. At present, how seldom is this the case.

Prisoners' Aid Societies must be multiplied. They are excellent institutions for taking care of men who come out of prison, and providing for them and helping them back to honesty.

Industrial homes, too, are excellent for women, though apparently not so good for men. Take these people by the hand—to make them good may cost something, but not so much as to keep

them bad or to make them worse. I don't want any one to be pampered, in or out of prison. I don't think prisoner's diet, as is now the case, should be better than workhouse diet. I don't want the criminal treated better than the honest man who cannot get work, and so on. But I persist in regarding the criminal as an unfortunate person, and crime as after all the most expensive luxury; and though honest folk may be a little jealous of money and care spent on criminals, yet all honest folk are the better for the radical cure and prevention of crime.

112. But if you think we are making the prisons too comfortable and too attractive, throw all the prisons open, and let any honest people who like go into these prisons to work.

How many would go in? This was tried in Scotland. The cry was raised, "You are making the prisoners too comfortable." Then Mr. F. Hill, a prison governor in Scotland, threw his prison open to the honest folk. The honest folk immediately failed to see the comfort of prison life. Those who could work preferred working outside, and those who would not shrank from the prison discipline.

The fact is, to be obliged to labour, and to be put under discipline, is far more painful to some men than anything else, and more than counterbalances the charm of prison life, which is only seductive when seen afar off.

When the Scotch governor threw open his prison, only about one in fifty was voluntarily admitted, and out of that small number almost all were people who had been in prison compulsorily, and submitted to prison life voluntarily only until they could see their way to get work outside the prison doors.

113. Then I am against repeated short sentences. To punish a man, as some have been, seventy times ("Int. Cong." p. 624) with the same small fine or short imprisonment is a farce. Besides, short sentences leave no time for remedial agencies, whilst long sentences keep people away from temptation, give time to eradicate bad tendencies, and to break up those bands of evil companions ever on the watch for the criminal when he comes out.

114. There is a good deal to be said in favour of cumulative punishment for offences often repeated.

115. The separate system is indispensable to the self-respect and moral improvement of the prisoner. He should go abroad in the prison masked. None but the officials and authorities should know his face, or communicate with him. He should be severed from the influence of those who, like himself, have come into condemnation.

116. People say criminals can't be reformed. It is nonsense to talk of a mixed class in this way. If you said our present discipline doesn't reform many of them, I agree with you: but if you can show—and you *can* show—that English methods have failed where foreign ones have succeeded; that wholesome work and encouragement cures a disease only aggravated by the lash and the treadmill, you have shown that criminals *can* often be cured by the right method, only not by the wrong one.

When all is said and done, there may, for aught I know, be plenty of incorrigible ruffians, who must simply die out and leave the world cleaner without ever getting clean themselves; but let us at least see that it is in spite of the right methods, and not in consequence of the wrong ones.

117. And the great method of all is the method of love. From the prison governor to the gaoler, let the criminal feel that he is in the hands of friends. Let them show him in every way that they mean him well, that the very discipline he is under will be useful to him, that his labour is productive, that his efforts at improvement are watched and encouraged, that his future is an anxiety to those who dispose of his present, and that steadily day by day everything in prison life, whilst repressing the bad in him, is rousing and cultivating each germ of good, and training in him good tastes and incorruptible habits.

118. These are no maudlin and visionary phrases. They are the slow, beaten-out conclusions of long laborious years, of keen and loving lives.

They are the principles of John Howard, and of a greater than John Howard: they are the principles of Christ Himself.

Upon you lies the burden of carrying them out, for you have to supply the public opinion which is to strengthen the hands of Government in the coming prison legislation.

Give the criminal classes those favourable conditions in prison which if many of them had had out of prison they would never have become criminals. Remove the stumbling-block from the path of the young, for if you do not do that when you can, you are no better than those who cause Christ's little ones to offend.

119. Lastly, it is the duty of society never to cease pardoning, for Christ said that seventy times seven was not too often to forgive an erring brother.

Treat the debased, not upon the lowest, but upon the highest platform of human feeling; believe in them, and your faith will remove mountains.

That is how Garibaldi bowed the hearts of the degraded population of Southern Italy as the heart of one man. That is how a greater than Garibaldi conquered the world.

To be good to the unthankful, to be kind to the faithless, that is a hard lesson, but it is the lesson of the cross, it is the very love of God, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

120. Oh, for the broad, and the tender, and the unwearied heart of Jesus! We cannot go on long enough, working, and praying, and loving, and waiting. We give in, we are so soon discouraged. We will have instant results or none, the first check dispirits us.

A man experiences some ingratitude or rebuff, where he was trying to do good, and he says he won't be taken in again.

A person loses his temper, because some one has not thanked him. Because others are cold, we cannot be kind; because others are evil, we cannot be good. We sink to their level instead of rising above it.

Rise higher. Learn from Christ, who was lifted up, how to draw all men unto you; learn to think for them, to feel for them, to work for them, to suffer for them.

Provide conditions.

Pardon offences.

Prove love.

So shall you be the disciples of One who died with a malefactor on his right hand and on his left, and in dying opened Paradise to the criminal.

PAUPERISM.

PAUPERISM.

121. Paul on Charity.
122. Charity and Almsgiving.
123. Benevolence and Beneficence.
124. Pauperism is decreasing.
125. Act of 1834.
126. Sound Principles.
127. Public Opinion must Act on the right lines.
128. Decrease of Pauperism coincides with the Rise of Charity Organisation.
129. The Charity Organisation Society.
130. Attention invited to Causes of Pauperism.
131. First Cause, Intemperance.
132. How to treat Pauper Drunkards.
133. Make the Poor-Law do its Work.
134. The Poor-Law itself a bad Makeshift.
135. Wages lowered by it.
136. Improvidence Encouraged.
137. Children and Parents neglected.
138. Wives Deserted.
139. Drink and Gluttony promoted.
140. Discontent Fostered.
141. The Right Class missed.
142. What is wanted.
143. How the Poor-Law arose.
144. The Hopelessly Destitute.
145. Over-population.
146. Emigration.
147. Hereditary Pauperism.
148. Striking Case.
149. Rescue the Children.
150. Compulsory Education.
151. Unwise Almsgiving.
152. Beggars stopped by Police.
153. Frozen-out Gardeners.
154. The Salmon and the Fly.
155. Lord Coleridge and "Sudden Calamity Folk."
156. The Exceptional Shilling.
157. Give liberally, but wisely.
158. Mischievous doles.
159. Coals and Soup Tickets.
160. Teach People how to save.
161. Gradual Reform.
162. The Provident Knowledge Society.
163. Every one can do Something.
164. The Charity Organisation Society.
165. It Teaches how best to give.
166. It Enters into every Detail.
167. What are the Results?
168. Praise and Blame.
169. The Latest Calumny exposed.
170. How to Estimate the Good done.
171. How much Money is disbursed.
172. St. Mary's, Bryanston Square.
173. The "C.O.S." Balance-Sheet.
174. Real Weakness of the "C.O.S."
175. Supporters of the "C.O.S."
176. The Detractors of the "C.O.S."
177. Help in Money.
178. Personal Help.
179. How to proceed.
180. The "C.O.S." Circulars.

IV.

PAUPERISM.

THE Apostle Paul, in that great thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, on charity, remarks: "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth *me* nothing;" and he might have added, "*nor any one else either*," for indeed alms given without thoughtful love are in every sense goods given to feed the poor with no profit, but not without damage to all parties concerned.

122. We are apt to confuse the word charity with almsgiving, yet the two are quite distinct.

You may be very free with your alms and yet not be charitable; for charity means love,

and love means not only *benevolence*, or kindly feelings, but *beneficence*, or well-doing. Now you don't do well if you only think of yourselves, and the gratification of your benevolent emotions.

Some charitable people only think of themselves, or if they think of others they don't think enough about them, and so what they do does harm. Real beneficence is a two-edged sword: cutting both ways, it works out the double and perfect labour of love in blessing others, through the gratification of our own best and purest feelings.

123. Be you benevolent and beneficent. When you give, ask, "Will this do any real good? Is it not sure to do harm?"

When you cannot answer these questions for yourselves, you must use other people's brains and experience. This is a kind of division of labour which goes on everywhere, and saves boundless waste of time, of money, and energy. And sometimes you will have to trust to the opinions and researches of others, who have had opportunity and insight where you have had but little.

I do not ask you to go along with people you cannot agree with and feel with, or to adopt methods you don't understand; but at the outset balance feeling with common sense, in the name of thoughtful unselfish love, or else, though you bestow all your goods to feed the poor, and give your body to be burned, it may all turn out to be no charity, and will profit you nothing.

124. Now we come to cope with this great question, just as we shall have in our next chapter to cope with drunkenness. Indeed the two are near neighbours, and both are the close allies and relations of crime. But that most fruitful source of pauperism is not uppermost to-day. Crime has formed the subject of a separate discourse. But I will here repeat a most significant fact relating to drunkenness, and ask you to compare it with another fact relating to pauperism, which is this—that drunkenness is on the increase, while pauperism is on the decrease; which means, whatever else it may mean, that we have not got on the right lines in dealing with drunkenness, but we have got on the right lines in dealing with pauperism. Now what

are the leading facts which prove the steady decrease of pauperism, notwithstanding the increase of one of its main causes, drunkenness?

125. We may roughly date this decrease from the Poor-Law Amendment Act of 1834, which opened the eyes of the English public to another main cause of pauperism, viz., the indiscriminate and reckless almsgiving of the benevolent public. Lord Brougham used to complain that the greatest mischief to the community was not done by the wicked, but by the right-meaning wrong-headed people; and indeed rich, charitable folk did (and are still doing) an infinity of harm.

126. The Act of 1834 first made people think. It provided a central authority for dealing with parish and county pauper cases. It compelled the able-bodied pauper to work out his support in the house. It abolished the "allowance" system for filling out the wages of paupers; it thus curtailed the outdoor relief, which had actually begun to unsettle the labour market, by enabling the needy to take lower wages. It checked illegitimacy, by compelling the father,

instead of enabling the mother, to support the child. It helped the labourer to move more freely from one parish to another, by revising the laws of settlement. These enactments of 1834 proclaimed again the old apostolic precept, that if a man would not work he should not eat, whilst they separated the industrial from the pauper class outside the house by withdrawing make-weights for wages and leaving wages to find their natural level, and pressed well home the social ties and family responsibilities, instead of, as heretofore, putting a premium upon improvidence and neglect.

127. These were the reforms of the Act of 1834; and let me ask you is it not an encouraging thing to know we are so far on the right track in dealing with pauperism, that we are not muddling in the dark, with a kind of hopeless feeling that we don't know whether we are doing right or wrong.

Now I appeal to your intelligence and thoughtfulness this morning. Is not our object to decrease pauperism, to make people independent of alms by making them depend on themselves, to help them to help themselves?

Is not that the greatest charity? But it requires thought, and patience, and time, and care, and sometimes money; but, above all, method, the right method, and public opinion to back method. I want your public opinion, your thoughtfulness, and then we shall be able to travel together along the lines suggested by the legislation of 1834. I am not one of those who think we can do everything by legislation. It can do nothing, worse than nothing, unless it be assisted by the healthy and intelligent endeavours of public opinion, public opinion created by individuals. The individuals of a congregation, of a neighbourhood, of a town or country parish, are all bound up together in the work of social regeneration. All are to understand the folly of benevolent disbursements alone. All are to grasp in the cases that occur to them the principle of a general uniform method of action. And what is the clue to this general method? Simply experience of what has been done, and what has succeeded.

128. Now there is one remarkable fact, and it is this: that between the years 1870 and 1875 we have the most extraordinary diminution in

pauperism throughout the country. There was a decrease before that. True, but no such decrease as we have now to point to.

You will naturally ask what is the cause. Probably there were several causes. No doubt the higher wages, no doubt the spread of education, the spread of the feeling of independence, the general prosperity of the country; but, above all, the growth of public opinion, the putting down of impostors, the careful sifting of cases, preventing benevolent people from throwing their money into the streets, cutting off the penny or halfpenny from the beggar who comes up to you in cold and wet weather. All these things have helped to diminish pauperism; but, mark you, they took sudden embodiment as an organic form of public opinion, not legislative, but social and spontaneous, in the year 1869.

129. The first society embodying the kind of opinion here alluded to, and the kind of information here detailed, was started in September, 1869, in Marylebone. That was a committee for the organisation of charity, which has been followed up by committees all over London. I don't say the decrease of pauperism

is solely owing to this society—I have pointed to other causes; but I do say that to that society, embodying the slow growth of popular feeling, and the sound conclusions we have arrived at in dealing with the poor, is due in a great measure the credit of paralysing the hydra-headed monster of professional pauperism throughout the land. Why, in 1870 there were no less than a million and odd paupers returned throughout the country; and in 1874 that million and odd, notwithstanding the increase of population, had sunk to 784,000. If such a diminution has taken place, are you not bound to ask why? And then, when we find that this rapid diminution commenced with the embodiment of certain methods of action by the Charity Organisation Society, we have well-nigh answered the question; and then are we not bound to go forth and do what we can to complete the good work of pauper reform?

130. I will therefore ask you this morning to go with me rapidly, if not exhaustively, into some of the chief causes of pauperism, and as we review the cause, let us try and find the cure.

131. First cause, intemperance. I dwell upon that elsewhere, so I pass on. I declare simply that drunkenness is one of the great causes of pauperism, and that is evident when you reflect that the amount of money spent in drink would pay the poor-rates (that is, for the maintenance of those who drink themselves into poverty, as well as paupers from all other causes) over and over again. Now for the cure. I have dwelt very fully upon the different ways in which we might individually and collectively keep down drunkenness; and when you check drunkenness, you certainly check crime and pauperism.

132. The only way to deal with the pauper-drunkard who drinks his family into pauperism is to isolate him from the family, and refuse to do anything for the family until you have struck at the cause of their chronic poverty.

You can do no good to that poor starving family, because it is useless to hand over money to them so long as their improvident father is there to drink it away. We don't starve him, we simply drive him into the workhouse. The workhouse is at present the place for the incorrigibly bad and hopelessly destitute. My friends,

when we look at the poor-law as it stands, the first duty of everybody is to make the poor-law do its work; and that brings me for a moment to the distinction between the spheres of legislative and private charity. The poor-law exists to deal with the destitute and the hopelessly incorrigible; charity exists to prevent destitution, to help people to recover their independence—not to prop up the workhouse system by doles, but to save people from the workhouse.

Good people are always on the look-out for paupers, they want to help paupers. Well, you can't help confirmed paupers, but you may in a variety of ways step in in time and help people. Snatch them from the grip of the poor-law, as the dark shadows creep over their lives, but the hopeless paupers as a rule are not for you.

133. If the public is not to pay at both ends at once, the public must make the poor-law while it lasts do its work, by refusing to pay double tax in alms and poor-rates. To what purpose is such waste?

134. I am not now extolling the poor-law, I

look upon it as a kind of necessary evil, for a time at least; and when we have got our system, our private social organisation, like that at Elberfeld, for repressing mendicity, and organising charitable relief universal and complete, there will be no room for the poor-law. The poor-law, even amended as it is, is to an enormous extent responsible for the pauperism of the land. The vicious principle that every man who cannot support himself has a legal claim to be supported still remains; and the vicious practice of outdoor relief prevails, in spite of the theories of 1834, to an enormous extent. Here are a few of the directly pauperising effects of the present poor-law.

135. Wages are lowered; for the employer who has to support the labourer at last by paying poor-rate must deduct that from the scale of wages. The employer cannot burn the candle at both ends; the workman cannot eat his cake and have it. Without the poor-rate, wages would rise and the labourer would earn enough to lay by; but as long as his ultimate support is guaranteed by the parish, *however much* he may earn, he won't lay by.

136. Improvidence is directly encouraged, for you can't get people to save when their maintenance is already assured. Provident habits are directly discouraged, for the poor man who saves is practically deprived of the gratuity offered to the improvident man who spends all. The action of friendly societies and other means of self-help involving an effort to lay by, is to a great extent paralysed by a system of compulsory relief.

137. Neglect of children by parents, and parents by children, is directly encouraged, for if neglected, both will often be better cared for than if supported by each other.

138. Desertion of wives, often by collusion in order to obtain support, and often in the well-assured confidence that the parish will provide. Frauds of all kinds practised on the relieving officer to get an allowance when in work or in receipt of ample charity. But this is far from all.

139. Drink and gluttony are directly encouraged. Mutual benevolence and private charity, where such might act wholesomely and naturally,

are checked, whilst the oppressive poor-rate itself is constantly thrusting the poorer rate-payers into the ranks of the pauper recipients of poor relief.

140. All this time the greatest discontent amongst the poor prevails, the honest and industrious are soured and discouraged at seeing the tramp and thief cared for. The tramp and thief are never satisfied, where most relief is given there is always most grumbling—"Quo plus sunt potæ plus sitiuntur aquæ."

141. Lastly, the poor-law habitually misses the very class most deserving, *i.e.*, the class not quite down, or too proud to accept the pauper conditions; and is proved to be totally inadequate to meet a real emergency, like the Lancashire famine of 1863, whereupon the most ancient and sound usage of private benevolence has to be resorted to wholesale before the plague is stayed.

142. The remedy for all this, as far as the law is concerned, was clearly seen by Sidney Smith, so far back as 1819. It is the gradual abolition

of the poor-law altogether. Meanwhile we want a stricter veto upon outdoor relief as long as the workhouse lasts, a more rigid enforcement of labour, a system of sound loans, and an extended organisation of private and personal charity, to meet the cases now so disastrously the subjects of outdoor relief. What I mean will be more clearly developed further on; I glance now at the history, and proceed to define the position, of the present poor-law.

143. The poor-law was a "Tudor" device, invented to save from starvation the host of mendicants thrown suddenly on the highways through the suppression of the Religious Houses, those wholesale feeders of the poor in the reign of Henry VIII. It was a bad system supplanting a worse, for in my opinion it is a wrong thing for people to feel that they have a *legal claim* on public charity. Still, that is the state of affairs in England, and until we have a better one we must try and see that the poor-law, whilst it lasts, does what it professes to do, and with just as little injury and discouragement as possible to the honest and industrious portion of the community. Its certain

failure to do this adequately will be its best and quickest condemnation. Meanwhile your course is clear.

144. All hopelessly destitute cases that come before you, if you cannot undertake to give them adequate support, or refer them to persons who will be chargeable for their permanent maintenance by pension or almshouse, &c., then you must not give doles, but say, "These are cases for legal charity," and you should hand them over to the poor-law; and one of the cases to be so handed over most unflinchingly is the incorrigibly intemperate person who has reduced his family to beggary. You may be sure that nothing can be done with a pauper family until the drunkard is removed. His removal may not be his cure, but it may be, and often has been, theirs.

145. The second great cause of pauperism is over-population. No doubt the poor bring into the world large numbers of human beings whom they are utterly unable to support. This is one of the great difficulties that the legislature, and people who want to effect social improvement,

have to contend with. Sooner or later I suppose people will see that they are responsible for the number of children they bring into the world, but that is not a point I can go fully into at present. The redundant population, however, whilst a cause of pauperism, is held in check by a redundant infant mortality. Hundreds and thousands die in early childhood and infancy.

The fittest alone survive. This may seem a cruel law, but on the whole it works beneficially, for it removes useless mouths, whilst it fills hungry ones.

146. Another outlet is emigration. There is the natural method, death, and the artificial method, emigration; both are fighting on our side against the redundant population of our poor. But the fact is, *we ought to be able to make room for them all.* Our waste lands should be cultivated, our unproductive labourers put to productive labour, the resources of the land, together with the sense of thrift and the grace of sobriety, developed. We could then well afford to save our infant population, and stem the current of emigration.

147. Third cause, hereditary pauperism, that is, beggary from father to son. This great curse turns pauperism into a kind of law of nature. We are bound, if we can, to check that. What are the fearful facts?

Sometimes you have proceeding from one pauper woman (because she has been corrupted with doles, because she has not been dealt with, and put into a different position, where she would be helped to an honest living) a legion of devils. She gives birth to a family, each of whom becomes the parent of others, and in a hundred years you have a whole clan of social vampires and bandits.

148. There was a case in New York that came under my notice the other day, where a girl became a hopeless beggar at an early age—no one to take care of her, no one to come between her and penury. That girl had two sisters, and she dragged them both down with her. In eighty years six generations of paupers proceeded from that stock. No less than 623 beggars, vagabonds, and criminals were traced directly to those three forsaken, neglected children, left orphans and homeless at a tender age eighty years ago!

149. That is the sort of thing that is going on all over the country, and that is one of the reasons why I am in favour of isolating children by all means—by expense, if you will—by extravagant expense. I know I may be told that by taking pauper children, and bringing them up, I encourage the parents to neglect their responsibilities. I don't care. What I say is, we want to get rid of the bad and the evil, and to plant better seed; and I say you must take these children away from the influences that made them paupers, *and which encouraged their parents to neglect their duties.* The parents will die, and you must make out of these little ones the sort of people *who won't neglect their duties*, who will be industrious and capable of earning their bread. Isolate them at any cost, and save the future; for the past you can do nothing, for the present but little.

That I believe is the soundest position, and many people who were against taking poor children and beggars, and putting them out in honest families in the country, to board and be brought up, are now coming round to this opinion.

I believe that Mrs. Nassau-Senior, who is a

high authority, and has been greatly instrumental in promoting the system, is entirely in favour of rescuing young children and cutting off the evil root of bitterness (which will be done with when the old ones die off), so that we may have a better race, exempt from the pauper taint.

150. Again, fourthly, I am in favour of compulsory education; all kinds of schools, private, public, denominational—I care little what they are or where they are, so only they do their work, so only they educate the children, and snatch these poor innocents as brands from the burning. Isolate them, educate them. That is my cure for hereditary pauperism, and it is the only cure.

151. Fifth cause, unwise almsgiving. What are all the other causes compared with that! It is the mother of most of them, and many of you—how many?—are the aiders and abettors of it. It is discouraging to the honest struggling poor to see vagabonds, gifted often with more brains than themselves, employing those brains in preying on the charitable public.

152. Shall I tell you what took place in London some years ago, when it became at last evident that the charitable public were the great patrons of thieves and vagabonds instead of the relievers of real distress?

A special police force was told off at the instance of the Charity Organisation Society to arrest all the able-bodied beggars they could find, and they did so at the rate of forty a month, and it soon put a stop to begging in our streets.

I recollect a time when you could not go out in London streets without being beset by beggars just as you are in Rome; but those days are over, and now you hardly ever meet one of the shivering people who have not tasted food for a week, and are suffering from all the ills that can afflict humanity.

They are gone. People who starve in unknown garrets, and have known better days, and suffer from cold, are people who won't come out into the streets and ask you to give them coals and bread for love or money.

153. I remember some years ago one's ears used to be jarred with the strain of "frozen-out

gardeners" when the first snow fell. Who ever hears of "frozen-out gardeners" now?—the race has become extinct. I recollect a few years ago sending to my plumber to get some pipes mended that had burst by the frost. He sent me back word that everybody's pipes had burst, but that he could get no one to mend them, because his plumbers found it more profitable to tramp the streets as "frozen-out gardeners." The fact is, in winter the plumbers were all gardeners, and in summer the gardeners were all plumbers.

They found begging far more profitable. Why? Simply because there was no machinery at hand to try their cases.

You think, my friends, that you can tell an impostor by looking at him; you think you can trust your own judgment. So used I. But remember it is their trade "to take you in," and it is not your trade "to find them out;" and directly you make it your trade to find them out they disappear round the first corner or into the nearest beershop.

154. I do not want you to be suspicious of every one, but do not wrong the honest by

encouraging knaves. Look before you leap. Never you trust to statements, however plausible, without some inquiry.

Never you rise like a silly though benevolent salmon to the bait of a begging fly. Just feel if there is not a hook in it somewhere when one comes to you and declares that he must have his railway fare at once, or he must have £1, otherwise he would be sold up that night. Perhaps you are taken in by such an appeal.

155. The other day Lord Coleridge, at Winchester, said the more sudden the calamity was, the more he was certain it was a case of imposture. I am not saying there are no such things as sudden calamities, but I say the "sudden calamity people" are a well-known class, and they are robbers; if they are not, then justify them. What means do you take to find them out?

I am not saying that any one who accosts you in the street is necessarily an impostor; but you relieve nineteen impostors and one honest man in twenty. You are doing nineteen-fold to increase pauperism, and onefold to stop up the gap of pauperism, when you trust without inquiry.

156. If you are so moved, and if you are certain it is a real case, then I don't say you should not give. I am not in favour of hard and fast rules. I think every rule may have an exception, and you may come across the exception. Then give your shilling; but when you have given your shilling, be sure to take the name and address of the person and make further inquiry, or let further inquiries be made for you, and I think you will soon be cured of giving your shilling. Meanwhile give your shillings. It is a capital education for you all. Give your shillings out of the fulness of your hearts, and then take the name and address down; and if, in nine cases out of ten, the persons ever live where they say they live, my experience is worth little. The enormous majority give false addresses. No, that is not the way the honest poor are reached.

157. Unwise almsgiving is one of the great curses of the country. Alas! it is the good charitable people who are thrusting the poor, for whom Christ died, down into hell. But note the truth that is to balance all this repression of unwholesome waste of alms. It is this:

Preventive alms and remedial help. There is a noble but neglected sphere for private charity and Christian benevolence. The great thing is to help people before they are down.

Find them out, if you can, and encourage honest folks to make you their confidant. Employ any kind of machinery which will acquaint you with cases worthy of relief. Then help, and help effectually. But instead of giving twenty shillings to twenty beggars, why not rather give the £1 to one man?

158. We are enamoured of doles. We don't like to give in lumps. Popular charity may be defined as the art of making that useless to many which might have been useful to some *one*. You give a shilling to a man out of work: you might just as well give a man one boot. No, spend a little more, and get him a place or give him an outfit. If it is a real case of temporary calamity, then pour out your money. Let us have a five-pound note. It is better to help one real case than half a dozen that are utterly hopeless, untrustworthy, or about which you can give no satisfactory information.

159. Well, you must not suppose in this hard

weather, with the snow out on the ground, when we feel cold ourselves and we are going back to our dinners and domestic firesides, that I want to be hard at all. I only want to be kind in the truest and deepest sense. Though I am not going to inveigh entirely against coal-tickets, soup-kitchens, and blanket-clubs in winter, I still affirm that, as at present managed, these are pauperising institutions. I want you to think how it is the poor people come to want coals and soup-tickets and blanket-clubs; and that brings me to this further point and sixth cause of pauperism—the wonderful improvidence of the poor.

160. To meet this sixth cause of pauperism —improvidence—spend a little more money in teaching the poor, in showing them how they may save in summer. Give them cheap books, cheap lectures, counsel and help in time, and you will supersede the winter doles now so fashionable.

The improvidence of the poor is no mystery, for you put a steady premium on it. The man who drinks his money away, instead of saving a little and putting it by for the winter, knows

that in the winter you, or the parish, or both, will take care of his wife and family, and therefore he likes to enjoy himself; it is not his thought to get any enjoyment for his family, he enjoys *himself*, and you provide coal and soup-tickets and blankets for his family, and they are all the warmer, not at his expense, but at yours.

161. Now you cannot stop coal-tickets and blankets all at once. Just as the poor-law, giving a man an admitted claim to the alms of his country, is an element of pauperism, so are these other doles; but they are at present necessary evils, and you don't want to cut them off suddenly, because it would not be fair after teaching people to depend upon them. You must teach people better first. You may do this by introducing better methods, which will teach them more self-dependence.

162. Work out this problem in your towns and in your villages. If you want any practical knowledge, any details, go to the Provident Knowledge Society, get a set of the Provident Knowledge papers, one penny each (at 193, Piccadilly). Look over these cheap tracts, and

give them to the people in your parish. If you want any advice about the employment of the poor, consult Mr. Alsager Hill, 59, Greek Street, Soho, whose admirable labour agency is also a complete emporium of useful information.

And now glance at the Provident Knowledge papers.

Here, for instance, are hints to domestic servants, here is something about a "Balance at the Banker's," and "Life-Assurance for the People." Open one of these little books anywhere, and you read a short sentence in very black type at the top of the page. "*Every one should put by something each quarter.*" Here is a statement as to the amount requisite to cover the cost of dress for servants: that checks extravagance.

I open another and look. I don't know what it is about. It is "Pensions." What sort of pension? Having decided this, you will have to select the class of pension. The mode of purchasing is given, the most explicit directions, in the clearest print and the shortest paragraphs; the most practical information in the smallest possible compass. Put it into the hands of the poor.

You carry about tracts to prove every possible and impossible dogma of religion.

People are told how to get to heaven, but not how to live on earth. Give them a charm which will save them from beggary and pauperism, and teach starving and ignorant men and women how to keep body and soul together.

You want to convert sinnners. Why not teach them to surround themselves with conditions unfavourable to sin?

163. You must cope with the causes of all this poverty, by timely help, by adequate help, by remedial help, by teaching people to do without your help by helping themselves. That is my reply to the improvidence of the poor, and to the system of unwise almsgiving all over the country that has created and nursed it. And every one of us may do something in the right direction, wherever we may happen to live, in town or country.

164. Now I come to the last point. Sometimes you say, "We want to do good, but we have no time, or our efforts are misdirected and thrown away." Therefore I point you to a

machinery that will assist you in doing what you want in dealing with the poor on right principles. That machinery is supplied by the Charity Organisation Society.

Now the Charity Organisation Society, which I shall call the "C.O.S.," is clear and intelligible in its purpose and work.

165. First and foremost, its object is not to give money to the poor, but to help *you* to give *your* money aright. You can go or send there for advice, and if you have got a case you can get it tested.

If you give a shilling in the street, and don't know whether you have done right, you can send the name and address of that person, and get your information.

Although the "C.O.S." does give some relief, that is not its object. Its object is to prevent the waste now going on amongst charitable donors, and help them to direct their alms wisely.

Formerly the same person would levy contributions from half a dozen donors, who would all fancy they were the only givers. The "C.O.S." stops that, if only the donors, before they give, will consult it.

Then the "C.O.S.," which is gradually extending its network all over the land, is in connection with almost all charitable societies, hospitals, poor clubs, workhouses, and innumerable agencies for relieving distress. It can therefore economise and guide these various efforts, examine and advise, expose fraud and check waste.

166. Thus the "C.O.S." provides a common meeting-ground for all these agencies for improving the condition of the poor. At the committee you will find people who are on the Poor Law Board, people belonging to local and parochial charities. You thus get, for the first time, at the relief given by or through the clergy. There the cases are registered and kept, so that you have a complete catalogue of sifted cases. Imposture is constantly found out, and the deserving people are helped in the best possible way—referred to private individuals, or whatever machinery at present exists for helping them.

Send a person there: that is the best way of finding out how the society works. Suppose then you send up a case, they will tell you,

"This person ought to have temporary relief;" or, "You should advertise, and get the eldest girl out to service;" or, "The boy wants clothes to go to a good situation;" or, "Give the old woman 1s. a week for two months, on condition that the eldest son gives her another—he can afford it." "Give nothing unless the man signs the pledge, or is got away from the family;" or, "A hospital-ticket" (telling you where to procure it) "is the right thing;" or, "There is such a Society, or Convalescent Home, or Industrial Establishment you can get her or him in, in such and such a way, and we can put you into communication with the patrons;" or, "These people ought to emigrate. We will get their passage paid if you can see to their outfit, and superintend the man's rent—see that he works it out. They want supervision; go down and look after them, and see they get ready by such and such a date."

Everything is dealt with through existing organisations, and the "C. O. S." helps you to find them out in the speediest possible way, and puts you in possession of the best information on the subject: it provides you, in short, with a committee of reference.

167. If you don't know how to get at the society, apply to me, or write to the Central Council, 15, Buckingham Street, Adelphi.

And what are the results of the working of the "C. O. S." in Marylebone?

An enormous diminution of pauperism and corresponding conviction and exposure of fraud. And all over the country it is the same thing, wherever the principles of the "C. O. S." can be properly carried out. Wherever it seems to be a failure, it is simply owing to the difficulty of getting a hearty, and intelligent, and sufficiently large staff of workers. I am not going to disguise the apparent failure in some quarters, the poor results in others, and hence some discouragement and public distrust. Nothing but time and perseverance can get the system to work well, but the system *will* work, and it is the *right* system. Let us work on with these deep convictions, and not be eager for results, and they are sure to come.

168. How long has the society existed? It really started in the year 1868, at Blackheath, in a severe winter. Substantially its principles were then put in practice on a small scale, and it

was soon found that not only were impostors checked right and left, but that the honest poor were helped in a most effectual way.

Then we heard of nothing but praises of the Blackheath system, and a Charitable Organisation Society started a Branch in Marylebone, which finally won the good opinion of the poor-law officers and various charitable societies, and it was frequently used by the hospitals and the poor-law Guardians for the investigation of cases.

But the instant it became popular it began to pay the price of all popularity, abuse. Its principles were questioned, its results impudently denied. It was charged with maladministration, sectarianism, embezzlement, and so forth.

As long as it was obscure, everybody had a good word for it; but when it succeeded, no name was too bad for it.

Have you never noticed the same sort of thing in the case of individuals?

When a man is of no importance, every one can afford to pat him on the back. "What a good fellow! What an able fellow! Pity he does not get on!" But the instant he has

success of any kind, then we begin to hear all sorts of things about him: "Oh! don't you know this, don't you know that? Gets his money by a swindle, gets his fame by a trick. Most dangerous man, not reliable, not genuine," &c.

And the cause of all such detraction is not far to seek. People praise when they have no motive to do otherwise, but success is sure to interfere with some one; and the success of the "C.O.S." began to interfere seriously with impostors of all kinds, and it soon set the tongues of all impostors wagging against it.

Soon it began to scrutinise the balance-sheets and test the operations of various societies that had been mismanaged, and pointed out misapplication of funds and faults of management; so then it had the legion of sham charities and old rotten corporations against it.

Then it had to contend with that great difficulty, the feeling of the benevolent, who easily mistook an inquiry-office for a society intended to supersede the exercise of personal charity and benevolence.

169. But what is the triumphant cry that has

lately been raised against the Charity Organisation's own balance-sheet?

What is this last crushing exposure, this fatal blow that has at length fallen on the ignorant and unprincipled persons who conduct and advocate the Charity Organisation Society?

It is this: that the cost of administration is excessive, that they have spent 60 per cent. (which is perfectly true) on what is called cost of administration alone; and that only a small proportion of the money subscribed to the society ever finds its way to the poor.

That is perfectly true, only it is not true that the money is spent merely on costs of administration.

What does the Charity Organisation spend its 60 per cent. upon? Why, upon its own proper work of investigating cases of distress, directing and controlling the various streams of public and private charity; tracking knaves, and helping honest folks to honest work; helping others to give wisely, and lightening the poor-rates by its preventive and remedial agency.

We hope that every year it will be able to spend *more* of its funds in this salutary manner, in what has been called falsely cost of admin-

istration, and *less* money in direct doles to the poor, until the poor-law is abolished.

170. The "C. O. S." wants *you* to give to the poor. It does not want to give money to the poor, but you compel it to do so. It spends now 60 per cent. on its management and administration, and we hope it will spend next year 80 per cent., and that you will relieve it of the burden of disbursing doles, that so year by year it may have less and less to do with the direct intercourse between rich and poor, so good for both parties.

But what this society will do more and more, is simply to act as a society for investigating cases, advising benefactors, and suppressing pauperism, by removing step by step its various causes.

Still this balance-sheet cry is a very telling fallacy to put before the public, this 60 per cent. spent upon so-called cost of administration. People believe it, and think they understand it at once, but they don't really; they don't know the facts, and they don't understand the facts; they don't remember that the comparison (to be fair) should not be made between the 60 per

cent. costs and the 40 per cent. given in alms to the poor, but should be between the 60 per cent. costs *and all the money disbursed or accumulated by the poor through the operations of the society*, and then see how the matter stands.

171. How much money is annually disbursed to the poor through the instrumentality of the "C.O.S." never appears in the society's balance-sheet, because *other people have done* it after the society has paved the way; that is, through its *indirect agency.*

172. In St. Mary's parish, Bryanston Square, in Marylebone, every case that is relieved goes through the Charity Organisation Society; and about £400 in money was given last year, but not a penny of that appears as disbursed by the Charity Organisation Society, though in consequence of its investigations so much was disbursed.

Then if you take only ten districts, with an average of £400 per annum to disburse, you have £4,000 a year, not a farthing of which is given directly by the "C.O.S."

But this is only a trifle of the wealth guided and distributed, but without pauperising, for you must add those cases relieved by the hospitals through the recommendation of the "C. O. S.;" all the loans and doles given by charitable individuals, the pensions conferred through the advice of the "C. O. S.," and the people helped permanently to get their own living; and all those taken out of the hands of the poor-law and thus off the rates, rescued from the workhouse; and all those whom the "C.O.S." has aided to emigration, through the contributions of the charitable; and you will get hundreds and thousands of pounds spent to keep up the independence of the poor and help them permanently. And all this incalculable wealth is really disbursed or accumulated for the poor through the indirect agency of the "C.O.S." Yet only a small portion of it can ever appear on the books of the society.

173. Meanwhile, you have on the books of the society a few doles of direct relief, which the society cannot induce people to give themselves; and the cost of investigation, management, and administration (chiefly

the costs of investigation), which have been the indirect means of showering these thousands and thousands, not in an unproductive, but in a most productive and wholesome manner, upon the poor, distressed, and suffering persons throughout England.

174. We may well ask, now, What becomes of the strictures on the balance-sheet of the "C.O.S."?

No! the difficulty does not lie in the principles or in the balance-sheet of the "C.O.S.," but in the working of the local committees. When the committee is able, and up to the mark in numbers, things go well; but the difficulty is to get the right workers. Disappointment and failure come not from the principles of action, but from imperfect action or deficient organisation; and this can only be removed by your zeal, your ready hands, your loving hearts.

175. Meanwhile, we, the supporters and advocates of the "C.O.S.," are not afraid of obscure newspapers and anonymous detractors. We remember the great hospitals, which have given in their tribute to the utility of the "C.O.S.," the

Poor Law Guardians, the clergy in the several districts. We note the great organs of public opinion, and we ask, Who is on our side? We answer, the *Times* newspaper, the *Saturday Review*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Daily Telegraph*, and almost every paper of repute support the principles of the "C.O.S." And then we ask who are the kind of people who attack us? Sometimes no doubt they are a good sort of folk, who have never studied the question. Sometimes they are a shallow sort of people, who know just a little and don't know enough; or they are theorists, or sentimentalists, who have never done any good work in connection with the poor, and never had a day's experience, or mastered the A B C of the position, and they talk glibly enough about 60 per cent. of the cost of administration.

176. But I have my eye on another class of detractors. There are the bad societies; there are the jealous folk, and small party or specialist journals.

They are abusive because they are frightened, they are shaking in their shoes. I am not saying this without knowing what I am about. I

do not here say more than I know, but I know more than I say, and when the time comes I shall not be afraid to say it. Meanwhile I know very well who are opposing the "C.O.S.;" and they do it for this reason, amongst others, that the Council of the Charity Organisation exists partly in order to expose societies and persons who are public robbers.

The "C.O.S." does not attack people who differ from it, but when it is attacked it will defend itself. Let the nameless critics who make so free with our names come out of their anonymous holes. Let us see who they represent. Let us meet face to face, and we shall soon find who will stand without reply at the bar of public opinion.

177. Now I make no appeal to-day for the Charity Organisation Committee. God has prospered it in Marylebone. When it wants money you will give it. But I ask you, if you feel inclined to help in this work, to send your money to the Council, because, though we are (for the moment) fairly well off in Marylebone, there are poor districts struggling for want of organisation; and whilst I do not

think it would be right to employ the Marylebone Branch frequently without ever sending it a subscription, yet you might well send larger sums to encourage the uncheered workers now coping with straggling and neglected districts. Therefore, I say, send your money to the Central Council, that the "C. O. S." may be strengthened throughout London and the country.

178. But don't think it is your money only I want. I want yourselves. I want young men, gentlemen, and people of leisure to come to me; make my house an office if you like; and I am prepared, with my brother clergyman, to conduct all the correspondence necessary to put any of you into communication with the "C. O. S.," and to help you in this work of finding right work, and doing right work.

I want you to come and say, What can we do? Where shall we go? May we be almoners? May we go and inquire and report for the society? May we stand there, and be the friends and counsellors of the poor? We want to be fitted for some little sphere of usefulness

for two or three hours a day; can you tell us where to go?

Yes; you can take up and watch or inspect cases in Marylebone. You can go to Holborn, and the district there; or St. George's-in-the-East; or a dozen other places where help is wanted, where heart and mind, and kind and intelligent sympathy are wanted.

Will you undertake a poor case? Do you want to know some one you can safely give your alms to? I will give you a dozen such. Have you a poor case? I will give you, if you will, the best attainable advice. I think I can promise to tell you what ought to be done with such an one. We refer him to some society or agency, or person who will meet his wants, and set him up or tide him over. And if I cannot give you advice, I will get it, and the best possible advice, upon any subject connected with the poor; and we can deal together with other cases. Respectable people who have been brought down in the world, and don't want to make their affairs known—we can combine to sift quietly, and help these substantially, if you are only in earnest.

176. Therefore, if you have cases, there is an organisation, there is a machinery to do the work; not to supersede your work, but to do the work you cannot do. If you have not got cases, but only a benevolent feeling that is spending itself in the air, then come to the source of practical action at the "C.O.S." I would here be your helper, not superseding your functions, but directing them, if needful—opening up for you the central stores of information and experience, in order that you may not be robbed, or disheartened by the sense of waste and failure.

180. This morning I have had little books placed in your pews, and I have invested in over 1,000 of the most useful explanations of the objects of the Charity Organisation Society, and my choir-boys have orders to give you these as you go out of the church. And if there is a word in this discourse which you have not understood, or if you have any cases that you wish practically to deal with, I invite you to come to me, if you think that in these matters, at least, I am what the Prayer-Book calls sufficiently "discreet and learned," and let me be for Christ's sake a "helper of your joy."

DRUNKENNESS.

DRUNKENNESS.

181. Alcohol—Treatment of the Subject.
182. No Plea for Total Abstinence.
183. What is Moderation?
184. Effect on the Young.
185. Exceptional Cases.
186. Alcohol—a Luxury, not a Food.
187. Two Kinds of Food.
188. Does Alcohol Fatten?
189. Does Alcohol Warm?
190. Action on the Membranes.
191. Action on the Blood.
192. Action on the Heart.
193. Action on the Muscles.
194. Action on the Mind.
195. Recapitulation.
196. Drink, Past and Present.
197. Statistics.
198. The Hop Gardens of England.
199. £5,000 worth of Accidents.
200. Seventy-three Millions of Taxes.
201. Drink and Religion.
202. Legislation.
203. The *Spectator* and *Times* answered.
204. The Law is to Protect.
205. The Liberty of the Subject.
206. Correct Bad Laws.
207. Act of 1830.
208. Sunday Closing.
209. Early Week-Night Closing.
210. Reduce the Number of Publics.
211. The *Pall Mall Gazette* answered.
212. 18,590 Public-Houses in London.
213. The Magistrates are to Blame.
214. Public-Houses at Election Time.
215. Repeal Tea and Coffee Duties.
216. Several Suggestions.
217. The Permissive Bill.
218. Principles of Permissive Bill.
219. Benefit Clubs.
220. The Poor must have their Clubs.
221. Where are the Poor Eating-Houses?
222. Model Lodging-Houses.
223. Education and Cheap Lectures.
224. Religion.
225. Messrs. Spurgeon, Moody, and Sankey.
226. Sermons.
227. Hymn-Singing.
228. The Upper and Middle Classes.
229. Gentlemen drink late.
230. The Army.
231. City Clerks.
232. Lady Tipplers.
233. Doctors are to blame.
234. Vice and Disease.
235. Different Drunkards.
236. Appeal to Young Men.
237. Dipsomania.
238. The Remedy lies in Compulsory Detention.

V.

DRUNKENNESS.

MY subject lies in a nutshell. The burden of it is briefly this: that however good medicinally or chemically alcohol may be, the less we use it as a common drink the better.

I shall ask, What is the nature of alcohol, and what are its effects upon the poor and upon the rich? I shall show the connection between crime and drink, between drink and the facilities for obtaining drink; therefore, between crime and the facilities for obtaining drink.

I shall not disguise from you the disease, the waste, the pauperism, and the immorality which can be as directly traced to alcohol as a stream can be tracked to its source; but I shall also

point to the cure which we may look forward to hopefully in the threefold reform of the law, social habits, and individual lives.

182. In the first place, I am not going to make a general crusade against drink. Whatever I may think of total abstinence, to compel every one to abstain because some will take too much has always seemed to me unfair to the sober, and it may be also argued that temperance without, is intrinsically better than temperance with abstinence. At all events, I do not see my way to preaching total abstinence as a gospel. The Christian sacraments involve the use of wine; St. Paul recommended the use of it to Timothy; Christ was not a total abstainer, neither did He encourage it in others. But I would never discourage teetotalism; and I believe that in some neighbourhoods and for some persons it is the only road to temperance. There are also those who, if they preached not this, would preach nothing. I am with them heart and soul. I wish them God-speed, though the form of my work is at present a little different from theirs.

183. There is such a thing as the moderate

indulgence in beer, wine, or even spirits; but then you and I, or you and your doctor, might differ about the word "moderate." Claret holds 8 per cent. of spirit; champagne, 10; Bass, 14; sherry, 25; brandy, 50. I should call a wine-glass of sherry or champagne per diem, or two of claret, or a tumbler of Bass, and so forth, moderate indulgence. But who stops there? Some do, and they may not be appreciably the worse, though I deny that in the majority of cases they are any the better.

184. Then healthy young people can throw off almost anything up to the age of about thirty; they have this astonishing power, this fulness of the sap of life struggling against disease; but having once trained yourself to the habit of indulgence up to the age of thirty, you are not likely to desist—nay, you increase the dose. As the capital of strength in the bank of life dwindles, the cheques you draw grow larger and larger, until one day, to your surprise and disgust, they are dishonoured once for all.

185. Then there are exceptional constitutions, no doubt, which seem to stand extraordinary

violence — drunkards who die at seventy or eighty, and so forth. But we cannot legislate for exceptions; we lay down rules good for the vast majority in view of the enormous amount of harm that is done to the individual and to society at large by "drink," or alcohol in one of its many forms.

186. And now to the point. First, I remark that alcohol is a luxury—it is not a food. I am aware that this is still a disputed question, but the dispute proves at least that if alcohol is a food at all it must be so in a very small degree, or it would not be a matter of dispute at all. As a medicine, alcohol is doubtless useful, but under all ordinary circumstances alcohol is a luxury. Some people think stimulant helps them on with their work—makes them physically strong. We shall consider this in detail. Meanwhile, observe that we get an extreme amount of work out of animals without stimulant. We are but too lavish indeed with external stimulants of whip and spur and goad, but your dogs and horses are raised to their highest power of last and labour without alcohol. They will take it if you give it them.

I have seen carters pour a pint of beer down their horses' throats to save them from a collapse, or revive them for a time when exhausted, but that was "medicinal," not "normal;" and you can no doubt corrupt animals, monkeys, cats, dogs, and horses. You can create in them that kind of vicious taste for drink that does nothing for the nourishment or profit of man or beast. I heard the other day of a pony that shammed the colic whenever his master stopped at a public-house, in order to get his share of the drink; all which proves that, instead of men drinking like beasts, beasts can be taught to drink like men.

187. I ask, then, What does alcohol do for us? Does it improve blood or muscle, or build up tissue, or increase our mental or bodily power? Is it *bonâ fide* burnt like a fuel in the system? Is it, in a word, a food?

Dr. Richardson, who has carefully gone into this question, tells us that alcohol is not a food. What is food? Food is of two kinds, nitrogenous, or that which supplies the jelly-like substance out of which is built up the material or tissue of the body; and hydrocarbonic, *i.e.*,

heat-producing and respiratory. Note the two classes—*nitrogenous* or tissue-feeding, *hydrocarbonic* or heat-producing, which is *alias* for force-supplying. Alcohol is not food in either of these senses.

188. But you will say beer-drinkers grow stout, and calves are quickly fattened with gin and barley; but it has been shown that these effects are not due to alcohol, but to the starch and sugar imbibed, and that, if the influence of alcohol comes in at all, it does so indirectly by unhealthy sleep and disordered functions causing various kinds of degeneration.

189. "But at all events," it may be said, "alcohol warms you up for the time; it is surely hydrocarbonic, or heat-producing." The coachman's great idea in cold weather is to have a glass to warm himself. Who has not seen the poor cabman vainly trying to expel the cold with pint after pint, dram after dram? Well, the spirit makes him feel a certain tingling or sensation of warmth and refreshment, before leaving him colder than ever, but it is not really heat-producing. When you drink in cold weather

you experience a warm shock because the blood is discharged in a warm sheet from the centre to the circumference, thus affecting at once a larger sensitive surface, but it leaves the heart cold, just as when a blast of soot comes down the chimney we see it makes a burst of flame, but it cools the fire; and so alcohol, instead of making you warm, really cools you. Each draught robs the heart, puts out your central fire. You may stir and stir, you may drink and drink, and each time more will be wanted and less effected, for there will be less left to produce any effect with.

190. But if alcohol does not build up, it destroys. What is its action on the MEMBRANES? Every organ and muscle of the body is wrapt about and separated for its functions by gelatinous membrane. Upon the integrity of this membrane depends the building up and nourishment of the body, and it must at all times be thoroughly saturated with water. Alcohol greedily drinks up this water. The membrane thickens or shrinks, and the fluids no longer pass freely to nourish and sustain the tissue.

191. How does it act on the BLOOD? The

health of every part of the body depends upon the free circulation of the tiny blood corpuscles through all the minute windings of the system. Alcohol often runs them too closely together. Their very shape is changed, their power to absorb gases impaired, and when the blood cells are sufficiently massed together, they pass less easily through the minute vessels of the lungs: hence the sudden deaths from congestion, hence also phthisis. Out of 2,000 consumptives, it was found that 360 alone were not due to drink.

192. And the HEART? Spirit whips up the pulse notoriously, but what does that mean? Enlargement of the heart by excessive action, enfeeblement of the heart by reaction, stretching and coarsening of its delicate valves and cords; hence irregular supply of blood, from which every organ and function suffers, until local disease of some kind or other is sure to be set up.

193. But does not drink give strength to the MUSCLES? By some curious experiments, which consisted in tying weights to animals excited by stimulants, Dr. Richardson proved that their

muscular power was in no one instance increased, and that it soon became impaired; indeed, he says, "If we treated our domestic animals with this agent (alcohol) as we treat ourselves, we should soon have none that were tameable, none that were workable, and none that were edible."

A friend of mine told me, when he was in Scotland last year, walking over the moors, he could walk the keepers off their feet, because he drank cold tea whilst they drank whiskey. He was not a total abstainer, but when he went in for extra exertion he cut down his stimulants.

194. But alcohol strengthens the power of the MIND? It stimulates the brain only to leave it prostrate. At a pinch it may help us to go on, or nerve us to do what without it would be impossible, but as an habitual resource it has proved, and will ever prove, delusive and disastrous. A gentleman told me the other day that in his office, when, owing to a great commercial crisis, there was a fortnight of high pressure put upon the clerks, they had to work day and night, and most of them took to stimulants. My friend cut off his stimulant and took to coffee

and solid food. At the end of the fortnight all the other men were laid up, but, he added, "I was better than ever." I may add that Dr. Carpenter, whilst approving the use of alcohol in the treatment of diseases and in certain exceptional constitutions, does not believe in its power to sustain us under bodily or mental exertion, extreme cold or heat, vicissitudes of temperature, bad air, or in its power of helping us to resist sundry other morbific agencies—fever, malaria, &c.

195. What, then, are the facts? Alcohol does not strengthen the mind; alcohol does not make tissue or improve the membrane; it does not purify the blood, but corrupts or deteriorates its very elements. It induces disease of the heart, the liver, and the lungs, and fosters consumption to an enormous extent; it brings on diseases of the brain, the spine, and the stomach, and the nervous system generally; and there is no part of the body or the mind over which it has not, after being in long use, a most deteriorating and disastrous influence.

196. I now come to deal with the enormous

increase of drunkenness amongst the lower orders. This is a fact, not a fancy.

Formerly the English drank beer and wines, but the old liquors were not nearly so strong, and there was hardly any indulgence in spirits. Now they drink spirits drugged in every possible manner, and beer of every possible strength, drugged and otherwise, and wines cheapened for popular use, good, bad, and indifferent. The consequence is, amongst the lower orders, during the last thirty years, drunkenness, with its attendant evils, has enormously increased throughout the land.

People write to me from the country to say that in this and that village drink stops everything. At Brighton and elsewhere we hear of great temperance meetings, and deputations go down from London, right and left, to start temperance movements, and stem the rising tide that threatens to swallow up the industry and sweep away the savings of the poor. Meanwhile, books and pamphlets are streaming from the press—our magazines and quarterlies are full of the subject; whilst statesmen and divines seem paralysed in front of an enemy whose ravages they deplore without arresting.

197. The facts and statistics I am about to lay before you, disclosing this great evil, are perfectly *awful.* We use that word very lightly sometimes. You speak of a thing as being awfully nice; but I tell you that drunkenness is awfully nasty—it is about as awful and nasty a thing as you can well imagine.

I have before me some statistics which bring the history of this question down to 1874. In 1872 the number of drunkards was 151,084. Well, in 1874 there were 185,730 convictions for drunkenness. You want to put down pauperism. You wonder at the number of asylums and workhouses in this prosperous country; but what are the facts? Sixty per cent. of our pauper lunatics are directly traceable to drink. Seventy per cent. of the crime in our prisons and reformatories has its origin in drink; and drink is responsible for at least eighty per cent. of our paupers. It has been modestly estimated that one-sixth of the strength of the whole army and navy is impaired by this same habit of drinking. In 1872, £131,601,490 were spent directly in the purchase of intoxicating liquors, and many millions' worth of grain are annually wasted in their manufacture.

198. Have you sometimes looked with admiration upon the fair hop-gardens of England? You will regard them with satisfaction no more. Think what they would produce if properly laid out in corn to feed the people, instead of being laid out upon hops to make them drunk! That land, which is now being worse than wasted, would produce, at least, £13,000,000 worth of bread. But how shall we form any conception of the quantity of good grain, barley and corn, that goes to make beer and spirit instead of bread? Mr. Hoyle, in his admirable book, "Our National Resources," has helped us to this. He tells us that the quantity of grain used for beer and spirits annually would yield 188 loaves to every family of five persons in the kingdom. If these loaves were used as paving stones, they would pave a road ten yards wide and 2,000 miles long. If the loaves had to be carted away from the baker's shop, and tumbled into the Thames, and one horse and cart were used—taking 500 loaves every half-hour for ten hours a day—it would take more than 380 years, or 380 carts one year.

You could not bear to stand by and see 380 carts at such shameful work as that every day.

Yet it would be better for these 190,000 loaves to be cast every day of the year into the river, and actually destroyed, than that the same weight of grain should be daily used, as it is now, in destroying the health, wasting the resources, and demoralising the homes of the people.

199. But, if we can only estimate roughly the direct losses, who shall number the indirect ones? The goods manager of one of the Manchester railways admitted the other day that the company spent £5,000 annually in consequence of accidents and damage clearly traced to drunkenness; and it is said that 50,000 lives are annually lost through drink; and, on the whole, we have to sum up with Dawson Burns—257 millions annually lost, *i.e.*, rendered unproductive to the country, through drink.

200. But we are told by some statesmen that drink supplies seventy-three millions of taxes, and that the State cannot afford to lose that. But if you had no drunkenness you would enormously diminish the necessity for taxation; whilst you would increase the wealth of the

country, and therefore the tax-paying power, by liberating for productive industries millions that are now poured into unproductive or pauperising industries.

Is it not short-sighted, then, to say we must not get rid of the liquor traffic, because we shall lose the revenue of the liquor taxes? I say, without this hotbed of disease and crime and waste, the people would be better able to pay, provisions would be cheaper, life would be more attractive, health would be greatly improved, suffering of all kinds would diminish, and pauperism would vanish. When the State collects the liquor taxes, it is merely taking money out of one of its pockets to put it into the other; for the sale of liquor creates the crime and pauperism, and the tax on liquor is then levied to pay the damages! State-money and charity-money—*i.e.*, the people's money—are constantly driven round this vicious circle by drink. What fills the prisons? Drink. Who pays for the prisons? The State. Who occupy the police? The drunkards. Who pays? Again the State. What fills the workhouses? Want, born of drink. Who pays for that? The people. Who pays for lunatic asylums,

reformatories, hospitals, and every other miserable bung that we use to stop up the cracks and leakages of the great ship of the English Commonwealth? I say the people pay, and get nothing in return, save a very imperfect protection from the evils they are themselves creating and permitting. Put down drink, and shut up the workhouse, the prison, the hospital, and the lunatic asylum. Put down drink, and give the people busy hands and happy homes. Put down drink, and let the divine summer of health and religion break upon our diseased and darkened land.

201. And how is it to be done? Some people are for legislation. Well, I am in favour of legislation. Others are in favour of religion. Well, I am in favour of religion. But I do see how hopelessly inadequate religion in any form has hitherto been to meet this curse, and for this reason: religion has been busy with the disease instead of attacking the cause; and religion cannot attack the cause unless it is backed up by some such material agencies as legislation is fitted to devise.

202. I am constantly told that you cannot make people moral by legislation. No; but you can by bad laws, and no laws at all, greatly increase immorality. You cannot legislate people into temperance, but you can remove the causes of intemperance. Morals may not be a fit subject for laws, but crime is. Show me the cause of crime, and I will show you a fit subject for legislation. Now, as I have before hinted, crime, to an appalling extent, depends on drink; drink, to an appalling extent, on the facilities for obtaining it; and therefore crime depends, to an appalling extent, on the facilities for obtaining drink.

203. I am aware that this has been denied. The *Spectator* points out that crime abounds in sober countries; but to go to other climes and civilisations, where other standards of morals obtain, is not to draw a fair parallel. Should you prove, for instance, that amongst a non-drinking class of savages, or in temperate China or Japan, infanticide is commoner than in England, you would not have destroyed the connection between drink and all kinds of crime in England. Again, the *Times* published some

statistics the other day to show that in Lancashire an increase of drunkenness had been accompanied by a decrease of crime, or convictions for crime; but we must remember that in the great cities of industry, like Manchester, drunkenness means wealth, and whilst that lasts the man has no temptation to theft and dishonesty, but he is tempted to drink. At the same time, only a small proportion of crimes of violence committed during drink come to be convicted—the man's family and friends persistently cover him. But drink is, nevertheless, the cause of crime; for when men have drunk themselves poor, and, by degraded habits, unfitted themselves for steady employment, they leave Lancashire, or the centres of industry, and spread over the country as paupers, thieves, and vagabonds; and then we have reached the stage in which the connection between crime and drink is again clearly traced.

204. Ought there, then, to be no efficient legislation against drunkenness?

The instant any sort of coercion is breathed, we are met with the liberty of the subject, triennial Parliaments, and Magna Charta! Well, we

will respect the liberty of the subject—when the subject is not drunk; but then the subject must learn to respect our liberty. If no one is ever to be coerced in a free country, why is vaccination compulsory? Why are children compelled to attend school? Why are diseased ships put in quarantine, and bad meat confiscated, and false weights seized?

The law is, then, to protect the public; and if this is the sense of English legislation, why are the intemperate any longer free to tax the sober? Why am I to pay a policeman for preventing a parcel of drunken fellows from breaking my windows, whilst I am forbidden to interfere with the publican who makes them drunk? Will you be blinded by this argument about the liberty of the subject? Who has a right to tax me for these wretched self-made lunatics, whilst I am not free to arrest the causes of drink and madness? If a man chooses to injure and disgrace himself, why is he to pick my pocket?

205. Again, who goes on paying for remedial agencies that remedy nothing? Why, at present, you do, and I do. If there are those who

claim the right, over and above what is decent, and healthful, and needful, to indulge in things which enormously increase the weight of taxation, thus limiting my income, my liberty, and, sometimes, destroying my life—shall I not claim the right to stop them?

The liberty of the subject is all very well; but it is a mere blind when it is put forward as an argument for not attacking an evil which endangers wholesale the freedom, health, wealth, and morality of society at large.

But then you say there should be one law for the rich and poor. That is just my idea, as I will explain by-and-by. I cut off the poor man's drink because he gets drunk. Should the connection between crime and the drinking of the rich be ever as clearly proved, it would be time to attack the wine-merchants and the clubs. I would coerce the confirmed drunkards of all classes, in one way or other.

206. But now, how are you to legislate? No one is more conscious than myself that this question has not yet been looked at all round, and I can only hope to throw out here a few hints.

The first thing to do is to correct bad legislation as it stands. We must repeal the disastrous Act of 1830, which has multiplied indefinitely small beer-houses all over the country. The clause for selling beer to be drunk on the premises has only aggravated what it was intended to check. It was intended to stop spirit-drinking by inducing people, through increased facilities, to drink more beer than spirits. No spirits were to be sold, and the beer was to be drunk on the premises.

207. And how has the 1830 Act worked? Not only is the beer drunk, but the people are also drunk, on the premises—only without a license. At present every device is resorted to to detain people, and keep them drinking more than is good for them; light, warmth, music, society, drugged beer—nothing is neglected which is calculated to put the people's money into the publican's pocket. The public-houses and beer-shops are licensed for the wants of the people. Those "premises" have become a delusion and a snare; in nine cases out of ten the public-house supplies no real want, but simply degrades the neighbourhood. First, then, repeal the Act of 1830.

208. I think I have almost come to the conclusion that the Sunday closing of public-houses would be a good thing. Even Ireland has asked for this, but cannot move the beer Members in the House to rise and demand it. Sunday closing has many enemies in and out of the House. The efficacy of it has even been denied. It has been said that the drinking is only transferred from Sunday to Monday; but the working of the Forbes Act in Edinburgh tells a different tale.

The Scotch know as much about drink as any people, and they tell us that after the Forbes Act in suppression of Sunday drunkenness the convictions on Sunday fell from 367 to 53, and on Monday from 752 to 234; and that shows what can be done by legislation in a place where the disease has been studied and the remedy applied.

It is not generally known that out of the 115 millions annually spent on drink, fifteen millions are spent on Sunday drink alone. Second remedy then, close the public-houses on Sunday.

209. Thirdly, I would have the public-houses closed earlier on week-nights. But still we

must not forget that the public-house is the poor man's club, and, if you take his club in that form away from him, you must provide him with some sort of substitute. At present, he goes there to escape, too often, a slatternly wife—the cries of ragged children—foul air and dingy surroundings; he goes for society—for news — to hear of work — to enjoy light and music — and, alas! drink, which empties his mind of care and his pockets of coin.

But is he to have no recreation? Well, that is outside the province of legislation. You must provide that, or help him to provide it, as I will presently show.

210. Fourthly, I would fight for a reduction in the number of public-houses all over England. I am aware that some are for allowing free trade in beer, providing it be not drunk on the premises. I am against free trade in beer, because it has been tried, and failed. It was tried at Liverpool, and the death-rate went up to 55 in the 1,000. Then, outcry of judges, coroners, and petition of 123 medical men, followed by restriction of licenses severer than ever.

It was tried at Hull, and in ten years convictions for crime doubled. Therefore I am against free trade in beer.

211. A writer in the *Pall Mall* tried to show by statistics that the more public-houses, the less drunkenness. His figures were right, his inferences were wrong. With a public-house close to your door, you can get drunk at home, or you can get home before the police catch you; but where the public-houses are few, men stay and drink, are turned out, and fall into the hands of the police. Thus it is quite true: with many publics there are few convictions, and with few publics there are many convictions; but there is, nevertheless, more crime and real drunkenness with many publics than with few.

212. Licenses are now granted to supply the *reasonable wants* of a neighbourhood. Are there respectable neighbourhoods composed of nothing but dipsomaniacs? One would think so, on reviewing the number of public-houses. How many of them do you think there are in London? I can tell you. There is a *reasonable* supply of 18,500 public-houses in

London. There is one public-house for every 200 people; and an outcry is raised at the notion of limiting the number to one for every 500.

And what is the state of things in Glasgow? In Glasgow, in thirty yards you may meet with six public-houses. It is assumed by the licensing magistrates that every *five* yards a man may be reasonably afflicted with thirst, and so the legislature places a fresh beer-shop in his path to supply his reasonable wants.

213. Perhaps those considerate magistrates, who, in their abject fear of the great brewers and the publicans, are so eager to supply the poor man with his beer, will some day enter a little more into the feelings of the poor man's wife, who was heard to exclaim, in an agony of despair, "Oh, sir, I can get my husband past five public-houses, but I can't get him past seventeen." Have you ever seen a woman struggling to get her husband home on some Saturday night—waiting outside for him—in a wild endeavour to save the remains of the week's wages? It is an awful sight. There is, perhaps, a little child by her side, or at her breast;

and there goes the drunkard reeling out of one public into another — the woman struggling vainly to get him by the last hell—the ragged child crying, because it knows that all this means no food, no fire, no clothes—the woman shivering and trembling, and almost fainting, as she thinks of the cudgelling that awaits her in the dingy cellar or rotten attic!

I cannot pursue this ghastly train of thought —I am sick at heart. I would limit the number of public-houses.

214. Fifthly, I would stop the use of the public-houses at election times. You will never get independent members elected as long as political meetings are held at public-houses. The drink interest controls the elections; if the publicans canvass against you, they are the popular centres, and they will beat you. If you are for the Permissive Bill, or for the restriction of licenses, you won't get in, as long as they pull the strings, as they do now.

The great brewers are the spiders, the public-houses are the network of threads—but they are controlled from the centres. The large spiders sit in the middle, and suck the blood

of the community, and paralyse every political effort that is made to put down drunkenness and snatch the fat fly from their greedy and poisonous fangs. Personally, the great brewers may be very estimable people, but they have inherited a system of trade which is rotten to the core, and the reform of this system would end in shutting up, at least, half the public-houses in the land.

215. Sixthly, I would repeal the duty on tea and coffee, and make it as easy and as cheap —or, rather, easier and cheaper to get than beer and spirits.

216. Seventhly, I will allude to several more useful hints for legislation :—

Proposed, to adopt the Gottenburg system, by which all the liquor-selling is transferred to a respectable company or the Government. No one to receive any profits on the stimulants sold —profits being made on the other drinks and provisions. This has worked most happily on a small scale, where it has been tried, but is thought by many to be too sweeping for London.

Proposed, to raise the price for each glass, which would probably end in some getting too much, and the rest nothing.

Proposed, to prosecute publicans for each drunken case traced to his shop—a measure not always wise when possible, and not always possible when wise.

Proposed, to refuse or take away licenses from drunken publicans—absolutely just.

Proposed, to insist upon no sale of liquor without food—a condition too easily evaded to be of much use, a crumb of bread representing food.

217. And, lastly, we have the Permissive Bill to deal with. The Permissive Bill would enable one-third of the ratepayers to prohibit altogether the sale of intoxicating liquors in a neighbourhood—such prohibitory vote to be annual.

I am not prepared to say that this is wise or possible; but we can all be sure that it would diminish drunkenness and its attendant evils. At the same time, it is only fair to remember that in most neighbourhoods people drink beer, and only a small minority of them get drunk,

and the majority only take beer moderately with their food, when it will do them little, if any harm. To stop this extensive and comparatively modest gratification for all, except those who can afford to have their liquors from a distance, seems oppressive to some; but then this Bill is *permissive*, not *compulsory*. True it is the majority lording it over the minority, but it is also the better elements in the whole ruling for the whole; and that, after all, is very much the way in which Englishmen are content to be ruled in every other department of Church and State.

218. Then, the principle of the Permissive Bill is merely an extended application of the present principle of licensing; viz., that the liquor trade should supply the reasonable wants of the people, but should not be the means of injuring the neighbourhood. Every licensing court professes to act upon that principle; and let me tell you that had the magistrates done their duty we should never have heard anything about the Permissive Bill. They sit there, those solemn guardians of the public peace, not only to judge of the reasonable

wants of a neighbourhood, but to protect the public morality. They know that nine out of ten public-houses are nuisances, and yet, cowed by the great brewers and afraid of local clamour, they renew licenses year after year to such an extent—an extent of one public-house to every 200 people—that at last the question comes to be, not whether a district shall have one or fifty public-houses, but whether it shall have any at all!

If the Permissive Bill, or anything like it, passes, it will not be due to the teetotal agitation, but to the unscrupulous rapacity of the great brewers and the insatiate greed of the publicans. Liverpool has tried to curb this, by steadily refusing to re-grant licenses that lapse on the house changing hands, and this works well. There are many who are anxious for some kind of Permissive Bill, but there are more who are asking, angrily, "*Why do not the magistrates do their duty?*" The answer is, alas, because they are not backed by public opinion.

You have to supply that opinion; the roused common sense and common feeling and common utterance of an enlightened community

can alone put down the facilities for obtaining drink, and stop drunkenness.

219. I pass now to indirect, but not less potent remedies, outside legislation.

Firstly, it is proved that benefit clubs that meet at public-houses promote drinking—the old go there to drink, the young learn there to drink. I would have them meet elsewhere.

220. But, secondly, you must remember that the public-house is the poor man's club; if you take it from him, you must give him something else. Not only something that is good for him, but something that he will like.

The poor have got heads and hearts, as well as the rich. They want amusement and solace, they want light, and air, and society. Give them free libraries, free classes, or cheap popular ones. Give them open spaces, bands of music, winter gardens, attractive coffee-houses, and places of resort where they need not get drunk for the good of the house, and where they can take their wives and families, and sit down to cheap and wholesome food, in places not utterly dismal, surrounded by associations not utterly degrading.

221. Thirdly, this brings me to a most important third point, cheap and cheerful eating-houses for the poor. The cheap and cheerful drink-houses I object to. Where are the eating-houses? The large, well-ventilated, cheap dining-rooms? The apologies for them are dismal and cramped dirty holes—no light, and little air—nothing for the eye. The bricklayer prefers snatching up a bit of cold meat and bread, and goes off to the nearest public—and no wonder; and so the favoured house gets most of the coin—and, again, no wonder.

But the eating-house should rival the drinking-house. I am told that the enormous profit on the drink enables the publican to decorate and render his house attractive.

My answer is, look at Boston. There, the cheap eating-house, with its lounge, and cheap newspaper, and social chat, and light, and decoration, rivals, and often beats the public-house.

Look at Paris, Brussels, Rouen—there is not a Continental city which is not better supplied in this respect than London.

Look at Glasgow—not a model of sobriety, I admit, but, for that very reason, the first to put the cheap dining-room on the right basis, and prove that it will work.

I am told that in London it has been tried, and failed. Then, without delay, investigate the cause of that failure. Ask why others have succeeded. Try it again. It may be that the taste will have to be created, but it is worth creating.

I am told that cheap feeding abroad turns on soup, and that the Briton won't eat slops. But why won't he? *Because he floods his stomach with beer.* But I don't want to rob him of his beer—if he must have it. Let him have it wholesome and in moderation; but don't bribe him to drink. Model food is at least as important as model houses—to which I now come.

222. Fourthly, you who want to do good must not wait for the sufferer to originate the remedy. The poor did not originate model lodging-houses, and the poor won't invent cheap dining-rooms. Those things must be thought out by others for them, and they will not fail to support every movement which is really for their health and profit, if that movement is started in the right way.

Drink is no doubt caused by bad atmospheres. Our ill-ventilated counting-houses and govern-

ment offices, warehouses and factories—these are the tempters; and the evil culminates in the filth and squalor of East-end and West-end cellars and garrets.

I am in favour of model lodging-houses; the subject is too vast for me to enter upon here. Whilst I am averse to begging capital from the charitable public for this purpose, I would earnestly invite landlords to sacrifice a portion of their 8 and 10 per cent. on ruined and squalid houses, and content themselves with 5 per cent. from the same houses kept in a state of righteous repair; and I would exhort those who want to strike at one fruitful cause of intemperance to invest capital, at 4 or 5 per cent., in those sound commercial speculations under such leaders as Sir Sidney Waterlow, which have for their object the improvement of the houses of the industrial poor.

If you leave people in pigstyes they may never come out; but, if you drive or coax them out, they will think twice about going in again. Improve the public, and you will ruin the private house; but improve the private, and you will ruin the public-house.

223. Fifthly, educate the people. We are told that education does nothing to diminish drunkenness. It may not do everything; it is not true that it does nothing. At present, drink is almost the poor man's only pleasure. Give him other interests; open his mind; teach him how to save, how to learn, how to understand; where to go for direction in the affairs of his hard life; teach him about his health, the art of doing better in his trade, the reason of high wages and low, the machinery by which he may provide for his old age and his family in winter.

All this I call education. Give it by cheap lectures, popular advice, and tracts. You give him tracts on every dogma of the faith—on the Bible, on the Church, on the saving of his soul. Give him one on the savings bank, and on the saving of his body.

Get the "Provident Knowledge Papers," recommended in a former chapter. Here is one on "Pensions," showing how, by weekly payments, he can buy one; another on "Life Assurance;" on "Pawnbrokers;" one for "Domestic Servants"—full of explicit directions of how to act, in short sentences, in easy paragaphs—any child can read and understand

them. They cost one penny, and they may save untold shillings.

You say education won't do alone—you want religion.

224. Sixthly, then give the poor man religion. At present the public-house is the poor man's church, and beer is his Bible. Suppose you bring him to church. What is there for him to understand or feed upon? The liturgical prayers—beautiful as they may sound to our cultivated ears—are not couched in his vernacular. The lengthy service goes leisurely on; he cannot hear half, especially if it is a High Church; the other half he scarcely heeds. The hymns are for the choir, not for him. Every one is more at home than he is. The poor man's particular wants are not mentioned; his special trials are overlooked in wide general statements; and, by the time the clergyman gets into the pulpit to speak to the poor man's soul, the poor man is fast asleep! I do not say that the Church services cannot be adapted, and are not sometimes adapted, to the wants of the poor; but not often enough and well enough to make him feel, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord."

225. No! we censors of drunkenness must go to Mr. Spurgeon and Messrs. Moody and Sankey if we want to know the form of religion relished by the poor—ay, and to a great extent by the middle classes too — prayers in the modern dialect, in everyday words, long *extempore* utterances flowing warm from the heart of one who loses himself in becoming the spontaneous mouthpiece of the people.

226. Sermons — homely, practical — about Tom, Dick, and Harry, and a parson not ashamed of an anecdote or a well-timed stroke of humour, dealing straight with the difficulties of thrift and soberness, and full of warm pathos and passion, and a burning desire for the salvation of souls and bodies.

227. And hymns! loud and long, not skipped through at express speed by vocal racehorses, who seem to require no wind and no stops; but leisurely, winning their way, like a good ship gathering in all the breeze of heaven, so gathering in the voices and the hearts of the people, until the praise swells high and rolls along triumphantly before the great white throne and Him that sitteth thereon.

Try an easy, taking hymn with twelve or twenty verses, and see what an effect you will get out of an unlearned congregation, and how they will come together again and again to engage in a kind of hymn-singing they can master and enjoy; but, I say again, we must go to the best Dissenting communities to learn this. But is it not worth learning? I say it is an open gate—it is the way to fill men with the Spirit instead of new wine and bad beer; it is base excitement expelled by the exhilarating and beneficent and wisely adapted influences of prayer and preaching and praise.

228. I will now speak of drunkenness in the middle and upper classes. We constantly hear their sobriety contrasted with the inebriety of the poor. No doubt there is less open drunkenness. For instance, I am constantly reminded that gentlemen after dinner do not now make their appearance in the drawing-room in a state of intoxication. I have no doubt that it is so, and that at the beginning of the century it was not so; but then, seventy years ago men were not thought any the worse of for being drunk after dinner. I am glad to know that drinking in

one form has diminished, but I fear that drinking in other forms has increased. Men used to drink more wine and they drank deeper; they now drink more spirits and they drink oftener. The consumption of spirits has enormously increased of late years.

229. If gentlemen don't drink after dinner, they do when other people are in bed. In country houses all over the land it is the fashion to go into the billiard-room or the library, and smoke and drink, and drink and smoke, and drink again — and what drink? unsweetened gin and all sorts of mixtures, until the fumes rise to the brain and the hand shakes and the feet totter.

I am not censorious. I do not deny the charm of a quiet pipe and a social chat in the small hours, and the consequent almost inevitable sip of something or other. But I would ask, how often is the late drink an excuse for the chat, and how often is the late chat an excuse for the drink? When we laud our after-dinner sobriety let us put things fairly. I do not want to ask the condition of a man at half-past nine or ten o'clock at night, but what is his

state at half-past two or three the next morning? I am afraid, if we take stock of the late pursuits of many of our "gilded youth," we should see nothing rose-coloured about them but their faces, which might indeed be rosy enough — but flushed, alas, with drink, not health.

I fear drinking has not so very much decreased as some people think. No doubt public opinion is against it, and downright intoxication has doubtless decreased owing to the feeling amongst the rich against open drunkenness; and the same thing would result if there were a public opinion against it on the part of the poor, only unfortunately there is none. But still we are not sober: we tipple and drink, from the court to the slum.

230. Look at the army. I don't hesitate to say there are some cavalry regiments about as bad as they can be in this respect. I heard the other day of a colonel who had never been an abstainer himself, but who on taking command of a certain regiment, which shall here be nameless, declared himself so horrified at the amount of drunkenness amongst the officers,

that he became a teetotaller in order that he might set them an example. In the expensive regiments the messes are too luxurious and too much wine is drunk; in the poorer regiments it is not so bad; still the abuse is there, and the abuse spreads downwards. When the men know that the officers drink, do you expect them to keep sober? Example is stronger than precept.

I have said the army and navy loses one-sixth of its efficiency through drink. Whose fault is it? It is mainly the fault of those who preach but don't practise—the fault of officers, who fine men for drinking and are drunken themselves.

231. Then, again, look at the commercial world. Why, in the City nothing is done without a glass of sherry. Men take glasses of sherry all day long. A clerk goes out for five minutes, it is for a glass of sherry; let a friend call—another glass of sherry; somebody comes on business — another glass of sherry. The next day it is brandy and soda in the morning, and so on over again. There is a constant pull on small doses of stimulants. No one is quite

drunk; but who is quite sober? And the habit once contracted, grows on men, and I believe this is on the increase in most large towns.

Young men slip into drink idly, thoughtlessly; they don't really want it, it is all nonsense. Oh, that I could make them see the evil of it—this slow poisoning of the sacred well of health—this oil of vitriol cast upon the roses of youth! But I cannot stop to make any appeal now, and facts are more eloquent, more sternly persuasive. I pass on.

232. Of late years grocers and confectioners have been licensed to sell alcohol: hence a great increase of drinking amongst ladies. They go there, or send, when they would not dare to enter or send openly to a public-house. And who is to blame? To a great extent the overstrained condition of fashionable life at high pressure. A woman must always be able to smile, and in society she must smile continuously, or she is thought dull or blighted or unattractive; so she takes all sorts of pick-me-ups, bought at the confectioner's, to whip up her drooping spirits for the ball, for the flower-show, or even for the

afternoon at home. I am told that the railway refreshment stalls and cloak-rooms are great drink centres for women. They buy those little flasks at the counter, go to the cloak-room to empty them, leave the bottles there; and the revenue from these perquisites is so large that the attendants are glad to take the cloak-room service for next to nothing on condition that they are allowed to sell the *ladies' empty bottles!*

233. And who else is to blame for all this? Doctors have been much to blame by a reckless use of stimulants in illness. Women contract the taste in the hour of need and cling to it afterwards; and this has, I repeat, been encouraged instead of being checked by doctors. A doctor writes to me, "The medical profession, like every other, has its commercial side as a money-making business. The chief necessity with the doctor is to please. He can gain ready access to the hearts of the working classes, especially widows, by recommending the comfort of ale or spirits. He easily pleases gentlemen by introducing them to some new or good wine, and he becomes popular with young ladies if he advises champagne. *All this is done to an immense extent.*"

It is fair, however, to notice the powerful medical reaction against stimulants that has lately set in under the auspices of Dr. Andrew Clark, Sir Henry Thompson, Dr. Richardson, and others.

234. And now, how are we to attack the plague of drink amongst the rich? The first thing to be done is to draw a distinction between a vice and a disease. You may cure yourself of a vice, but a doctor must deal with the disease. You must call on some one else to take care of you when you cannot take care of yourself.

There is drunkenness and drunkenness, and many a stage to be dealt with before *dipsomania*, or the irresistible impulse which means disease.

235. There are tipplers who are never drunk and never sober. There are men who break out and positively become dangerous and irresponsible every three months, or more or less. There are those who have inherited drink tendencies, but who might nevertheless cope successfully, as we constantly see people do with natural infirmities, for is not every one able within limits to improve upon his stock? What

else does moral culture mean? There are others who have created in themselves the vice they did not inherit, and as the present is often tainted by the past, so shall the future through these men be corrupted by the present; and these are the dipsomaniacs.

236. I speak to the young men, the light of the Present, the hope of the Future. I tell them they can control themselves if they choose, when it is a question of vice. I will prove this. You can stop this incessant tippling, this deliberate and wanton destruction of the virility of your nature. The young man who has lapsed into idleness, or through mere ignorance fallen into drinking habits, thinks, "Oh, I cannot help it;" and suddenly there comes an appointment, and he finds he cannot write his name plain. His hand shakes, his head swims—he cannot fix his attention. Perhaps he is disappointed, and a friend says, "What is the use of getting you appointments, when you are not steady enough to take them?" "That's true," says he, "but I will try again." And so he does. He abstains for a month, and at the end of that time his head is clear. He

feels fresher, and he can write his name plain. A man wants to win your good opinion. You know he drinks, tells his family he cannot help it; but he comes to your house and behaves himself with perfect sobriety. You make the motive strong enough, and how many men can abstain? In the presence of royalty they don't reel. In the presence of persons in a higher grade of society they can keep sober. If a man knows he has an important object in view he can often keep sober, yet that very man at another time has what he calls an *irresistible* impulse to drink. It is no such thing. "Come along, old fellow, have a glass of something." "A telegram! wait a minute." Opens and reads. "Come home; your youngest daughter is drowned!" What has become of the irresistible impulse? It has been swept away by a mightier one. Ay, and prayer can do the same. It can fill the soul suddenly with such a tide of emotion that the barque about to founder is lifted over the rock, and floats out into the deep waters of God.

Young men, you think there is no geniality without drink. I tell you it is a mere fashion. How did your grandfathers and great-grand-

fathers dine, and how do people dine now? Then the fashion was at dinner to drink much and talk little; now the fashion is to drink little and talk much. Which is the most genial? Drinking is even going out at Oxford and Cambridge. It is a fashion. I say it comes in here and goes out there, like tight lacing or "no cards."

Young men! social influence leads you; lean upon it, but let it lead you right. Get friends with sober men, who can talk and laugh without incessant liquor. Choose men better than yourself; get a taste for them. There are good, pure women who can help you too—women in whose presence you would blush to commit yourselves, women in the strength of whose pure and perfect and tender friendship you can be made strong—women who can say to you, "for my sake," and for their sakes you are willing and able to be good. Oh, what beautiful hours are before you! "What lands of harvest bright with autumnal foliage and the glow of sunset burning low!" What angels standing in the golden fields and saying, "Thrust in thy sickle, and reap!" And if you will not sow in temperance, at times in tears,

then "what famine of the heart, what pain and loss — the bearing of what cross!" Young men! are you the sons of promise, are you the children of hope? Be temperate and wise and strong, for all things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's!

237. And now a word on dipsomania. There are about 600,000 habitual drunkards in England, Scotland, and Ireland, the greater proportion of whom are dipsomaniacs. They are the enemies of the human race, and they should be locked up.

In America they are locked up; nay, they generally go into voluntary confinement. They surrender their liberty for a time, and so only can they be cured. They go in—94 per cent. of them at least — voluntarily, but they are detained compulsorily, and with the happiest results.

We ought to have power to do this, for to abandon our helpless women and children quietly as a prey to 600,000 capricious maniacs is too monstrous!

Who does not know of such cases, who has not suffered from them? I am touching your

hearts now when you think of husbands, brothers, uncles, cousins, who are really dipsomaniacs, who really have not the power of controlling themselves, and who ought to be locked up, and would be in any other country but England, where we have the "liberty" of the subject, the liberty of uncaged wild beasts, the liberty of incarnate devils—the liberty to get drunk and ruin families and blight posterity, and waste the wealth and health and happiness of untold thousands, and spread disease and plague recklessly around. Indeed, sometimes we hear of people going to Scotland or Malvern for the water-cure: they go into voluntary confinement for a month or two. Directly they get better they come out and begin again; but if they had been *kept there* they would have got well and have been ready for work in life—ready for love, ready for business, ready for the outlets of Christian and manly activity.

But we have no authority to curtail the liberty of the subject, and until we have we cannot deal with dipsomania: it is a disease, and the law will not allow us to cure it. Like one who controls the water-works, but stands

by and sees a fair fabric reduced to ashes sooner than turn on the water to extinguish the flames, so is our Government hand-tied, so are our Members of Parliament tongue-tied, by the great publican interests that have sent them to Westminster. They dare not put down drink, they dare not even cure the drunkard.

I shall to live to see this set right. The strength of England rose in the teeth of colossal commercial interest, and put down slavery; and the strength of England will rise yet and put down drink.

The battle will be long, but the battle will be won. Never again is it possible for the people to forget what they now know. Never again shall the country grow blind to the terrible evils of drink.

But in the coming struggle none can afford to be neutral, none can stand by and stare.

238. I have dwelt upon the disease; but the remedy. The remedy is in your hands. The waste of public money is in your hands. The health and happiness, the morality and welfare of your children; the peace and comfort of your homes; the friends that God has

given you; the husbands and wives, and generations yet unborn; the rich and the poor—all these are in your keeping; for no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself.

Here, in the crowded thoroughfares of the city, as of old in the solitudes of Eden, unto us, the thoughtless aiders and abettors of wholesale murder, comes the terrible question, "Where is thy brother?" How shall we answer that question at the supreme bar?

The weak that could not help themselves will cry out against us. The bodies and souls of those for whom Christ died will be required at our hands; and now is the brief appointed time for us to think, to feel, to act for them, as Christ felt and acted for them. You are to strike the cup of fire from the drunkard's lips. You are to give the cup of cold water to the disciple in the name of a disciple. You are to loose the poor souls fast bound in prison; you are to bind up the broken-hearted, preach deliverance to the captives. For the Master is come, and calleth for thee. Make ready the new heavens and the new earth, for by your labour and your love shall evil be paralysed and the kingdom of God set up on earth.

EMOTION.

EMOTION.

239. Greeting.
240. Emotion Objected to.
241. Emotion and Sensation.
242. The Heart must be filled with something.
243. "Fraud, Nonsense, and Enthusiasm."
244. Emotion and £5.
245. Pecksniff.
246. Useful and Useless Feeling.
247. Emotion, True, Balanced, Dignified, and Faithful.
248. Power of Emotion illustrated.
249. The Steam-Engine.
250. Columbus.
251. Wilberforce.
252. Cobden, Bright, Gladstone.
253. Bishop Colenso.
254. David Livingstone.
255. Livingstone's Journals.
256. Livingstone's Character.
257. Livingstone's Death.
258. Garibaldi.
259. Garibaldi's Work.
260. Garibaldi in Sicily.
261. Garibaldi in Naples.
262. The Power of Music.
263. Emotion and Good Music.
264. Musical Emotion.
265. Direct appeal of Music.
266. General conclusion of the whole matter.

VI.

EMOTION.

I AM delighted to come here to-night, and to address you at your own invitation. I believe that nothing but good can come from meetings of this kind. I say, throw open the gates, let the people come in; let every one who aims at self-improvement come and find it on this day—the only day that many of you have to spare for reflection or culture of any kind.

> Let knowledge grow from more to more,
> But more of reverence in us dwell,

(reverence, that is, for all that is worth reverence,)

> That heart and mind, according well,
> May make one music as before,
> But vaster.

240. Now, I have undertaken to address you to-night on the "Use and Abuse of Emotion;" but you must pardon me if I leave the "abuse" of emotion very much to your own imagination.

A great deal has been said against emotion and enthusiasm generally—its danger, its futility, its weakness, its want of manliness, and so forth. But, after all, some kind of feeling must underlie every moment of life. Emotion in some shape is coextensive with intelligent being. Your life is made up of intelligence and emotion. The more thought and feeling you can make room for, the richer you are. The use and abuse of thought would be a grand topic, but I confine myself to-night to the use and abuse of emotion.

241. What is emotion? Physically, it is accompanied—some would say caused—by the quickened pulse, the rapid motion of brain-molecules, and the consequent disturbance and spread of nerve-currents. Thus it has its sensational side. But it is more than sensation. Distinguish between sensation and emotion. If you knock a man down he feels an unpleasant sensation; he brings his thought to bear on that sensation,

and the *emotion* of anger is the result. That may possibly culminate in the action of knocking you down; hence more sensation, followed by reflection on your part, emotion of anger, action; and so on over again.

You perceive, then, that emotion demands the union of thought and feeling, or, as Tennyson has it, "heart and mind according well."

242. Now, the great secret of a worthy life is to have the emotions well in hand, and to make them do honourable work; for if you do not make your emotions do honourable work, they will be sure to degrade you. Something the heart must have to grind, and if you will not give it good grain, it will grind chaff.

243. In view of these remarks, all sneering at emotion and enthusiasm, which is one manifestation of it, is seen to be irrelevant. A short time ago I happened to read in some journal an article by one of those persons who know every one's business better than their own, and who look down with a lofty contempt upon all modes of thought and feeling unintelligible to them. There was this expression: "Fraud,

nonsense, and enthusiasm." The three were classed together as a matter of course. Well, my common sense revolted against that. I said, Either this writer is merely showing off, and does not believe what he says—in which case he is guilty of fraud—or he can have no knowledge of his subject, and is probably talking nonsense, or he is certainly a little heated, and has allowed his feelings to run away with him. In that case he is the prey of a not very respectable enthusiasm. It is even possible that he himself may be "a shocking example of the frightful effects" of the very fraud, nonsense, and enthusiasm which he so bitterly condemns.

244. People blessed, or unblessed, with certain temperaments are apt to condemn enthusiasm, but they perhaps forget that no good work has ever been done without enthusiasm at the bottom of it. The great heroes of the world have been men capable of being lifted up with high and holy enthusiasm. But emotion generally (and enthusiasm in particular) has got a bad name for several reasons. First, because feeling very often stands alone, and then it is not respectable; feeling is only re-

spectable when it nerves us for action. Here is a man who has all sorts of fine feelings. But we watch his life, and we see nothing comes of them. Then we distrust him. A person meets you unexpectedly in the street. He is very gushing. He says, "Oh! how long it is since we met! I am delighted to see you, my dear old friend: you know we were schoolfellows together." He shakes you warmly by the hand and continues, "I never had such a friend as you, and although I have not come to see you for a long time, I love you like a brother." You say, "Oh, do you? Lend me five pounds." If you had shot him he could not look more struck. He changes colour, and stammers out, "I—I don't happen to have five pounds about me just now." The fact is, his heart is in the right place, but his purse is in a very different quarter. Now, we don't consider that man's feelings respectable, for when the opportunity for acting upon it comes, he cannot find in his emotion the spur or stimulus for generosity. If you happen to want a little money, you will soon find out whether or not you have a friend in the world.

245. Again, feeling may be in excess. Some people, not perhaps of the male sex, are always in floods of tears. Of course this answers very well at first; but when it has been repeated too often, it is very apt to lose its effect. By-and-by the tears flow unregarded; we know how little they mean, for what trivial or unworthy purposes they are used. Their excess paralyses their effectiveness. The weeper wears out her welcome, and at last, like the lady in Dickens', she may go home in a flood of tears and a sedan chair, and nobody will much mind. Then there is what I may call the Pecksniffian form of emotion. There are men apparently overpowered by a deep sense of moral responsibility; they are always talking about the great duties they owe to society, but unfortunately they never discharge any of them. In short, said Dickens, they are like sign-posts, always showing the way and never going.

246. Well, now, when emotion comes before us in the shape of enthusiasm, or any other strong feeling, we are bound to ask in the interests of decency and common sense, Does it stand alone? Is it mere gush, or is it ready to

be backed by a five-pound note? Is it merely floods of tears? Is it weak, silly maunder? When a man who has had a little too much goes about shaking hands with everybody and asking them to dine with him every day of the week, what do we say? Why we say, "Go home, my friend, and get sober, and we will talk to you another day." Or is it Pecksniff? Well, then we say at once, "This man is a humbug; take him away; put him somewhere; don't bring him amongst respectable people; the world has much work to do, and we have no time for this vapouring and silly fellow." Do you not see, then, why emotion has got a bad name in the world? It is condemned, not because of its use, but because of its abuse. Remember, then, emotion demands the union of thought and feeling. It should be controlled by intelligence; it involves a reflex action of the mind; it is not a mere sensation as when a man feels pain; it is the mind working upon a sensation. But in order that emotion may be respectable, not to say useful, or even sublime, it must satisfy conditions.

247. First, emotion must be true.

Secondly, emotion must be balanced and correlated with our other faculties.

Thirdly, emotion must be dignified; that is, it must be devoted to some worthy object.

Fourthly, it must bring forth the fruit of noble action, it must be guided into right channels, it must set in motion useful machinery, it must do honourable work.

Then consider what a power it becomes in the world, how it touches everything from the least to the greatest. There is not an act, not a thought, hardly an inflection of the voice unaffected by it. Are not the orator's words weighted with emotion? Do we not feel at times how a passionate utterance will flow over a crowd, melt, animate, subdue, or rouse people to the wildest activity, and nerve them for reckless or indomitable action? And it is the manner far more than the matter. One man may read a sublime speech or poem, but if he betray no emotion it will fall dead, while but a few simple words uttered by another will thrill through and through you. You may have often experienced this in the case of a great actor: his lowest whisper has done what the misplaced passionless rant of another failed to accomplish.

248. I will repeat to you a passage first with the right emotion as well as I can, and then I will rob it of its emotion, and leave you to draw your own conclusions. Let me take that pathetic address to death and the land beyond the grave, in Longfellow. The poet breaks forth, feeling his soul troubled, feeling the pressure of the pain and sorrow of the world, and sighing for the peacefulness of death and the land where all things are forgotten :—

> Oh, land ! oh, land ! for all the broken-hearted :
> The mildest herald by our fate allotted,
> Beckons, and, with inverted torch, doth stand
> To lead us with a gentle hand
> Into the land of the great departed,
> Into the silent land !

Now hear it another way.

I have simply withdrawn the emotion, and you burst out laughing! So you see how emotion takes hold of the mind, winds it up and lets it down. The same thing is noticeable in music—in painting ; nay, even in atmospheric effects of outward nature. As when on some cold day you go out and look abroad upon woods and fields, life seems cheerless. "What a dreary chilly day!" you exclaim. But suddenly

the leaden sky is rifted, the sun bursts forth, and brings a glory upon field and woodland. A thrill of emotion strikes through you, and the dreary feeling vanishes! So emotion in a thousand ways shines out and illuminates the landscape of life at all points.

249. Or let us put emotional power in another way. Look at a steam-engine with all its wheels, cranks, and pipes. It seems a huge mass of lifeless iron, and might be supposed, if seen only at rest, to be absolutely useless. All this mighty mechanism wants something. What is it? Steam. If you put in the steam, you will see the wheels begin to turn, and at last the steam will be fully got up, and the engine will speed away with an express train. What has been done? You have supplied the motive power. Steam is the engine's emotion. And, if we want to get men to work, we must put steam into them; we must kindle up emotion, and then they will begin to go. Every great man has had this power of concentrated steam in him, this emotion bottled up; and because he has had it properly under control he has been able to do great things.

250. Would America have ever been discovered if it had not been for emotion? Think of the enthusiasm of Columbus; think of the stupidity and apathy with which he had to contend. Think of him burning with the thought of this undiscovered land, until at last, in his little boat, steering in mid-ocean, he finds this new world. Ay! at the very moment when the hearts of all his fellow-mariners failed them the land hove in sight, and the enthusiasm of Columbus was crowned with an immortal discovery!

251. Or think of Wilberforce warring against the great selfishness of our country until he had called up an opposing force of sympathy, which ended in the suppression of the slave-trade. So that through an emotion—I do not deny that duty came into play, but a knowledge of duty unbacked by feeling is very inoperative—this man communicated his feelings to the whole country, until greedy money-loving men were willing to give up their incomes in the Indies, and become comparatively poor men for the sake of an idea, in order to put down the abominable slave-trade in the British dominions.

This was the work of Wilberforce. There was not much fraud, nonsense, or misplaced enthusiasm about that.

252. And if you look back on the great work of Cobden; Bright, and other reformers, think how they were in the same manner buoyed up through evil report and good report. Why, there is not a political measure of any importance which does not necessarily involve a vast play of emotion before it can be carried. Think within our own time of the repeal of the Corn Laws, the whole code of our modern sanitary legislation, the improvements in prison discipline, the extension of the franchise; think of the kind of opposition and the kind of triumph which has attended the long-sustained efforts of Mr. Gladstone's administration. It is to the exercise of a noble enthusiasm that we owe a long list of brilliant and salutary reforms, amongst them that great and courageous measure of justice to Ireland, the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. And notwithstanding his temporary withdrawal, I trust that we shall owe a great many more good measures to Mr. Gladstone before he retires altogether from public life.

253. And not long ago we have seen an example of singular elevation and purity of feeling in the person of Bishop Colenso. We have seen a man come over here, already suffering under a social ban through the fearless nobility with which he expressed opinions distasteful to a section of the religious world; we have seen him, already weighted heavily with years of unpopularity, yet willing to throw away in a moment the little remnant of comfort and social ease he might have enjoyed out in that foreign land, for an idea, a great idea of justice —justice to Langalabalele! Who cared for Langalabalele out in the colony where Bishop Colenso has to live? The cause of the natives is always unpopular there, but the bishop knew he had to stand alone and fight prejudice and injustice single-handed; ay, and win too. Who knew anything about Langalabalele over here? Well, we know a good deal now, thanks to the bishop. We know that England was committing an unjust act in her colonies when the Bishop of Natal got the ear of our Foreign Minister, and opened his eyes. And through evil report and good report did this Christian bishop persevere until he had kindled up an

interest in that poor savage chief; nor did he return until he had got justice done. And will any one say that he was throughout this thankless work sustained by anything but the noblest religious enthusiasm?

254. But I will take another labourer in a widely different sphere, who was equally supported by a concentrated life-long enthusiasm for the good of his fellow-men and the general advancement of civilisation. I allude to that great and patient servant of God, whose labours lay in the same far-off land, David Livingstone, whose heart lies in Africa, but whose toil-worn body reposes in Westminster Abbey. What buoyed up that noble explorer but the power of a double enthusiasm — an enthusiasm for science, but far more an enthusiasm for philanthropy? For science, because Livingstone wanted to settle the vexed problem of the sources of the Nile; for philanthropy, because he wanted to open up that fair land to European influence, and free it from the curse of the slave-trade. The terrible revelations he has made will, I trust, go far to rouse English feeling in the direction of African

reform. In fact, you know how Mr. Stanley has gone out, as leader of a joint English and American expedition, to complete the work Livingstone began.

255. None can have read Livingstone's last journals without being struck by those dreadful pictures of slavery that kindled his deepest emotion. He frequently saw hordes of slaves driven by their masters cruelly, and when they could go no farther they were tied to a tree and left to die, or their brains were knocked out on the spot. Children were torn from their parents, wives from their husbands. Their sufferings from fatigue and hunger were frightful; the tortures inflicted on them terrible. All this Livingstone was obliged to look upon; he could do nothing, except give his own life for these poor Africans in an attempt to open up their country and heal their grievances. Right and left he tried to make the natives see that their country was being depopulated, that all progress in well-being would be denied to Africa as long as the slave-trade continued to flourish. What he underwent in this crusade it is difficult for us to realise. There is a picture outside the book

which fitly sums up in an image Livingstone's indomitable pluck. It represents him wading, no doubt in one of the last stages of his illness, through one of those dismal swamps which he had so often to cross, now struggling through up to his chin, now borne on stalwart African shoulders, with his legs straight out before him, skimming along the surface, whilst the others followed him, bearing his precious provisions and trading bales of beads and cloth.

256. As we follow with bated breath his noble and simple narrative to its sublime and melancholy close, its great calmness and peacefulness win us. Those who think that enthusiasm must be noisy, let them study Livingstone. He stands up against adversity like a rock, his will is indomitable, his resources infinitely fertile, his enthusiasm unflagging; but not a boast, and hardly a murmur escapes his lips from first to last.

257. Livingstone's greatest discoveries are chronicled with the same simple brevity which characterises the daily incidents of his journey; nay, some of those incidents, such as the loss of

his poor little dog Chitane, who swam till he sank, trying to follow his master, seem to have affected him more deeply than greater disasters. His own privations are made light of. "Took up my belt in three holes because of hunger." "This last journey has turned all my hair grey." After more than usual treachery and idleness amongst his men, he makes all sorts of excuses for them, and says, meekly, "I, too, have faults." On the loss of his medicine chest—that fatal calamity which was indeed the beginning of the end—he says, quietly, "I felt as if I had received sentence of death," and he does return to this dire loss; but even that soon passes, with all other lets and hindrances, and we hear no more of it, save indirectly in the doctor's failing health and the complication of maladies which at last wore out his iron frame.

258. One other grand instance of the power of emotion I will bring before you in the life of General Garibaldi. No man has more obviously exercised immense power through the propagation and discipline of patriotic feeling than Garibaldi. When I was in Italy, during the great Italian campaign of 1860, I had

frequent opportunities of seeing Garibaldi as he appeared as Dictator of the Two Sicilies in that strange and stormy time. But what struck me most about him was his intense calmness; the unruffled serenity of the man in the midst of all the turmoil about him was marvellous. But along with this imperturbable repose of character he had that same power of concentrated enthusiasm stored up for the good of all Italy. What inspired that man was, in another form, what inspired Livingstone—a burning self-sacrificing love for his kind, and a burning indignation against injustice and wrong.

259. Garibaldi has been called a bandit and a freebooter, and much of his life and activity seems to countenance the charge at first sight, as though he gave way to a kind of disorderly thirst for conquest and military activity; but in Garibaldi this undoubted genius for war was purified and redeemed by one grand and concentrated passion—the love of man and the emancipation of Italy. When Garibaldi began his work the north of Italy was in the possession of Austria, a large slice out of the middle belonged to the pope, whilst the south groaned under the worst

despotism. Garibaldi has lived long enough to see the liberation of the whole land of Italy and Sicily, and he has certainly hastened that event by at least fifty or sixty years, probably more. I don't say that Italy would not have been free in time, but Garibaldi's enthusiasm enormously hastened the movement, and has saved the country a deluge of blood and money; for again and again he did with a handful of men, by a *coup de main*, what it would have taken the King of Italy years and years to do. By his concentrated enthusiasm he bowed the hearts of Italians from north to south as the heart of one man, and accomplished what great combinations without him could not have done.

260. There is nothing more remarkable in European history than that rapid and astonishing campaign which gave Sicily and Naples to Victor Emmanuel. You will remember the story, how pregnant with the deepest emotion, so that Italians even now speak of it with bated breath. Two little steamers slipped out of Genoa one moonlight night, crammed with 1,000 picked men, Garibaldi's famous Italian

legion. They slipped down the west coast and glided over to Sicily. Everybody said, "Garibaldi is mad; the king's government is in a ferment; he must be stopped!" But Cavour is too cunning to stop him. On the other hand, he protests and does nothing, and the next news is that after two bloody fights Garibaldi has taken Palermo and is master of Sicily. Over the way lies the kingdom of Naples. Poor Francis II. hears with consternation of the approach of the great bandit. But no one has time to speculate. Garibaldi has already pounced upon the mainland, his men are spread in ambush all over the hills. Then it is that Francis the king sends to offer Garibaldi fifty millions of francs and the whole of his fleet if he will be off and capture Venice instead of Naples. An attempt to arrest the earth's motion might have been more successful. Garibaldi was now at Salerno, he had left the bulk of his army in Sicily. With a few of his staff-officers, and without any army at all, he took train for Naples, then in the possession of a hostile force, the Neapolitan army numbering 30,000 men. What was his strength, his irresistible strength, in that supreme moment?

It was enthusiasm, nothing but enthusiasm; he relied upon it implicitly—it saved him, it saved Italy.

261. That last advance to the capture of Naples is perhaps the most dramatic and astonishing episode in the whole history of civilised war. The crowd gathered thickly about the engine, and climbed upon the carriages. more than once the train had to stop, and then advance again at a snail's pace. So Garibaldi arrived at Naples. The whole of the populace are with him, the town is in the wildest tumult, but the army is still faithful to the king. Garibaldi alights from the train and occupies two carriages with a few of his staff-officers, and then amid the shouts of the people he advances slowly into Naples. Yonder lies the gloomy fort of St. Elmo and the Castelnuovo, bristling with guns, manned by gunners waiting but the word of command to sweep the streets with grape-shot and shoot down the mob, for the army is still supposed to be attached to the Royalists. Garibaldi calmly approaches the great fortress; the guns are pointed at him, the matches are lighted,

the fate of Italy and her hero hangs in the balance. Garibaldi, as he comes within close range of the guns, cries to the coachman, "Slower! drive slower!" The poor coachman, of course, who is shivering in his boots, seems at first not to hear, when with a voice of thunder, not accustomed to command twice, the general roars out, "Slower!" Then the driver draws in his reins, and at walking pace advances towards the castle. And now comes a moment so sublime that the memory of it will be handed down to the latest posterity as one of the grandest of emotional triumphs. The general, standing up alone in his carriage, with uncovered head, gazed steadfastly at the guns; then he surveyed the gunners with their lighted matches, and silence seemed to fall on the excited crowd; the suspense hardly lasted a minute. Three times the orders are given to fire. Once! twice!!—but at the third time the men threw down their matches and threw up their caps and shouted, "Viva Garibaldi!"

Any persons who think that fraud, nonsense, and enthusiasm have got anything to do with my love and admiration for General Garibaldi, had better hold up their hands, or else for ever after hold their peace.

262. And now, my friends, I am reminded by that clock that it is almost time for you to enjoy the selections of music which are to follow this address. Music is the language of emotion. I think the time will come when music will have an enormous power over men in rousing, recreating, and disciplining their emotions. We are only just beginning to learn, here in England, what a great and beneficial power it wields. Wherever there is music you will find the people flock to listen. Music, like everything else, may be degraded, may be made the servant of base emotions: it may be poor and frivolous, and it may be bad. Give the people good music, in order that their hearts may be raised and purified by the play of wholesome and recreative feeling.

263. In choosing a selection from "Elijah" to-night, that desire has been certainly uppermost in the minds of myself and others. This oratorio of "Elijah" is one of the grandest pieces of music that ever entered into the heart of man to conceive, or of composer to record. Mendelssohn's emotion was always true, balanced, and dignified, and his works are

irradiated with these qualities, which belonged so conspicuously to his beautiful and manly character. I believe myself that systematically hearing good music, when you have the musical faculty, does really teach the mind to balance its own emotions and keep them under proper control.

264. A great work of art, like a symphony of Beethoven or an oratorio by Mendelssohn, is nothing but the expression of those accumulations, windings, turnings, and legitimate developments and progressions of emotion which take place in the mind of a master workman. Our impulse is roused, then the mind is concentrated on a certain order of emotional development through sound. At a certain point you are left suspended and hanging as it were in mid-air, and wonder how you will ever come down again; but the great composer comes like a magician and leads you down through other phases of feeling, until you find yourself once more on *terra firma*, all the better for your excursion, refreshed and recreated, and fit for sober and vigorous action.

265. Music, by shifting suddenly the emotional

atmosphere of the mind, will often do more for us in five minutes than the wisest book or the soundest argument. For music deals straight at first hand with the emotional region, which is also the well-spring of our activity and highest use.

266. But this subject is too vast for me to enter upon now. You may, perhaps, feel disappointed that I have not dwelt to-night at greater length on the abuse of emotion. But, alas, it is too rampant in this great city in every form for me to wish to bring it out in painful detail before you on Sunday evening. I have rather in my brief address tried to show you, first, how narrow and irrelevant a thing it is to sneer promiscuously at emotion, and taboo enthusiasm generally; and, secondly, what it is which alone makes emotion valuable, and how irresistible it becomes when cultivated and developed in sufficient quantities, and directed by duty, honour, and wisdom into right channels. With these thoughts for you to work out more at length for yourselves, I shall now leave you to the undivided and profitable enjoyment of Mendelssohn's immortal music.

RECREATION.

RECREATION.

267. The Art of Unwinding.
268. Young Men and Marriage.
269 Good and Evil of Mixed Assemblies
270. Where Evil is, all is not Evil.
271. Useful Means Denounced.
272. Sunday Recreation.
273. Advice to the Sunday League.
274. Excursion Trains.
275. Sunday Excursionists.
276. Use, but don't Abuse Liberty.
277. The Fox that lost his Tail.
278. The defects of Puritanism.
279. Puritans and Art.
280. Use of the Churches.
281. The Church a Home and a Social Resort.
282. The Church a Seminary.
283. The Church and Organ Recitals.
284. The Church and Dissenters.
285. The Clergy and Amusement.
286. Why the Church is Unpopular.
287. Open the Museums.
288. Sunday Lecturers for the People.
289. Arguments against Sunday Openings.
290. The "Compulsory Work" Cry answered.
291. Culture for the People.
292. Cabs, Omnibuses, and Refreshments.
293. The British Workman can Protect Himself.
294. How to lead the People.
295. The Emotional Side.
296. Literature and Art.
297. Recreative Uses of Art.
298. Peculiarity of Music.
299. Effects of Music.
300. Why do People Drink?
301. Is Art Moral and Religious?
302. Art is neither in Itself.
303. Different Planes of Thought and Feeling.
304. Enjoyment of Art.
305. Popular Instinct.
306. The Æsthetic Thief.
307. The *Police News*.
308. The Power of Pictures.
309. Pictures for Children.
310. Advice to Good People.
311. Punch and Judy.
312. Mr. Boucicault and his Opinions.
313. Mr. Jefferson and Rip Van Winkle.
314. The Lessons of Rip.
315. The Drunkard's Character.
316. One Touch of Nature.
317. Mr. Henry Irving—the "Bells" and "Eugene Aram"—Tennyson and Shakespeare.
318. Music a Popular Recreator.
319. The Inner State.
320. The Man of Pleasure.
321. Work is the Key to Pleasure, and rouse the capacity.

VII.

RECREATION.

I PROPOSE to speak to you this evening on what must be a universally interesting subject, "Recreation." Recreation is one of the deepest needs of our nature. Next to self-preservation and the family instincts our two most powerful impulses are towards religion and recreation. The two have been foolishly severed, but they are closely related, for religion, whatever else it is, is the highest form of recreation. *Re*-creation means being born again, and so does religion. It is the imperative mood of our nature, "Ye must be born again;" but with the highest form of recreation, with religion properly speaking, I am not concerned

to-night. I shall use the word recreation in its more ordinary sense of amusement—common bodily and mental refreshment and relaxation.

You all remember the story of the old horse employed in the limekiln. Every day of the week he went round and round all one way; and when the day of rest came he was turned out to grass, and the best thing he found to do was to go round and round the other way, in order to unwind himself. Well, we all want unwinding. A reverse process is needed to recreate or make anew the exhausted tissues of the brain; you rest the brain by working it the other way round. Whatever you have been doing on a week-day, it is advisable to do something else on Sunday. Have you had little time for religion, or social, intellectual, imaginative, or emotional culture, or, let us say, fresh air and bodily exercise? When the time comes, you fly at it, your nature cries out for it; it is the food you want. You have seen animals a little out-of-sorts seek about the hedgerows, in among the long grasses, and find by their instinct the kind of herb that suits them. A similar instinct will guide you to the kind of thing which is good for your mental

and physical health, in the way of wholesome recreation.

268. Next to Religion, Family Life is the best and greatest recreator. No doubt the best rest for a hard-worked man at the end of the day is to go home to his bonnie wife and his bonnie bairns, but that you say is beyond some people's reach. So it is, but it is often owing to their own fault.

A great many more people might enjoy the wholesome recreation of family life if they were a little less bent on catching at every straw of pleasure, wholesome and unwholesome. Perhaps some people don't think of the enormous amount of money that might be saved by a little self-restraint. The fact is, the season when you ought to save is youth; but that is the season when there is least self-restraint. A young man told me last week that since he had given up his drink he had saved about ten shillings per week; so there he was, making a little income of twenty-five pounds a year out of simply giving up an indulgence he was better without.

I have not come here to advocate total

abstinence—it is not in my particular line; but I will say that if our young men drank less, and smoked less, and betted less, and spent less on flashy dress, they could better afford to marry, and have a home and an object to work for. They would be more settled, less dissipated in mind and body. They would keep fresh longer, and get rich sooner. They would not only, by well-directed industry, earn more, but they would keep more of what they earned; and they would be healthier, wealthier, and, I believe, happier men.

269. I believe this—I believe in settling the affectional instincts, in spite of all that can be urged against early marriages. But of course this must be left to every one's judgment. No doubt some people cannot afford to marry, and therefore they must wait, and do the best they can for themselves; but remember this, anything like solitary, unintellectual enjoyment is, as a rule, bad. All joy is not for you; some is for other people. You must contribute, you must be social in your natures.

We have all heard of the evils of mixed

assemblies. Wherever numbers meet together there is evil; but there is also good. This is a mixed world, and must be treated as such. I don't cut a man because I don't like the whole of him; I like some of him. I like him often in spite of much that is evil in him. There is more good than evil in him; and so, broadly speaking, of many mixed companies. And remember, in favour of mixed assemblies, when people are gathered together, there is always a certain check put by one upon the other. I am all in favour of large mixed assemblies. Their civilising and humanising influences have been greatly underrated. The danger to individuals has been made too much of.

There are fools and knaves everywhere. Of course, when we get a large number of people congregated together for *bonâ fide* amusement, or even for instruction, you must get a certain amount of evil.

Of course, the good and the evil in people comes out often glaringly in large mixed assemblies; and on this ground you will hear some people inveigh against all places of public amusement, such as the theatres, concerts, and music-halls of this great metropolis.

270. Well, I am not blind. I have not had very much experience of the music-halls; I am not blind to the evils that exist there, but I do say that I am totally averse to anything like one class separating itself off, by a hard and fast line, from another class. I am utterly against all decent people staying away even from music-halls. I think it is a great point to get outward propriety of behaviour—the courtesies and civilities of social life—enforced even there.

The moralist wants more; so do I, but I am thankful for that. I think very often by mixing people up together, you really do a great deal more good than if all the people who think themselves a little more righteous than the others stand aside, and refuse to have anything to do with them. If you do that, you make the right-minded people censorious and hypocritical, and the wrong-minded people determined to give the censorious people something to complain of.

Let me say that some of the first lessons in politeness and kindness are learned in these great mixed assemblies. The policy of some good people has been to extirpate everything they did not agree with, root and branch; but

that is not the way for the world to get on. I read somewhere, "Let both grow together." You must acknowledge the facts of human nature; and in the long run, whether you like it or not, people will amuse themselves in their own way, and you must improve them as best you can, without trampling on them. You may say, "I don't approve of this or that portion of your amusement, or of the kind of way in which you take your indulgence—it is too coarse, or excessive, or absurd; but you must recognise the fundamental character of recreation in some form—ay, and in a congenial form, according to the different classes concerned.

Each person will choose what really amuses him, otherwise he is not recreated at all.

271. But in pleasure, as in everything else, there is higher and lower, good, bad, and indifferent. Choose the best, open the right gates. There are people who talk vaguely about elevating the masses, but won't take the right means. They are too timid to take human nature as it is. *They want a reformed world before they can begin to operate.* One after another use of

means is met with the same old cry of Sabbath-breaking, irreligion, &c.[1]

272. You want to go to a museum on Sunday —you mustn't; or to an aquarium—you mustn't; or to this South Place Institute, Finsbury, to hear this lecture and a little sacred music—you had better not; or some fresh air and a country walk—and the acme of impiety is at once reached. Why? Simply because the advocates of Sunday recreation are supposed to be banded together for ungodliness, when they simply want, like the old horse, to fly and unwind themselves.

273. Now here is a lesson for everybody. It is not as if the right were all on one side. You, the Sunday League, have been abused, but you are somewhat to blame; for I think you will notice this, that directly people are abused they react, and acquire a sort of unwillingness to see the other sides of the question, because their opponents refuse to see their side. This is doing yourselves what you complain of in others. Thus the breach becomes wider and wider.

[1] See "The Sabbath," at the end of the volume.

Therefore, if I may presume to give a word of counsel to the Sunday League to-night, I would say, "Let your moderation be known unto all men." The more immoderate your opponents, the more wise and moderate be you. Don't let violent words be held in your public meetings or printed in your journal.

Go home and grumble, by all means; but just as a man sits down and writes a letter in a terrible rage, and then tears it up the next morning, saying, "Although this is perfectly true, yet I don't think it will do any good;" so reflect that we don't always do good by expressing just what we feel, that there must be a diplomatic selection of words, if words are to accomplish a good end. In all departments of life it is so.

Each day has its medley of thoughts and words; but it would never do to let all your thoughts out in words, or put all your words into actions. The whole power and propriety of life turns upon a wise natural selection of times, seasons, and sentiments. Let it be here as elsewhere what Darwin calls the survival of the fittest.

274. I will appeal to your indulgence and im-

partiality. I will say more. Your words and actions have given just cause for offence. What happens, for instance, in and out of excursion trains? what have we all occasionally seen and heard? Sometimes people are unconscionably noisy in going down—or perhaps, rather, coming back from the country.

Sometimes they get into a train to go down to some quiet country village; and by the time they get down they are very "jolly," and whilst they are there they get more "jolly;" and at last they get so "awfully jolly" that they cease to be "jolly" at all.

275. And what is the consequence? Why, they very naturally affront the demure, steady-going people whose village they have invaded. They have come ostensibly to enjoy the fresh air, but they don't enjoy it quite so much as might be desirable, for sometimes they turn out of the fields into other places, to where there is very little fresh air; and they enjoy themselves in close rooms, and when they come out, they are not in a state to enjoy anything, but they interfere with other people's enjoyment very considerably. They meet people coming back

from church or chapel, and they sneer at them, and laugh at them; and these good people hold up their hands in horror, and say, "Who are these Sabbath-breakers?" and, somewhat illogically, but not unnaturally, abuse all Sunday recreation and all Sunday excursionists.

276. Well, such things do happen sometimes, and are written for our learning; and we should remember that, when we use our own liberty, we should be careful not to interfere with anybody else's.

277. Still, I have been very much pained by the views which good people often take of every effort on the part of their fellow-creatures to unwind themselves. There is want of sympathy somewhere, and there is want of humour. A sense of humour is left out of some people's composition. The religious world is wofully deficient in it. There is a class of minds, worthy, good, useful in their way, but without the æsthetic or dramatic instincts; and they want to persuade people that they are better so. They remind me of the fox that lost his tail, and went about trying to persuade other

foxes that it was the right thing to have no tails.

But these are the Puritanical people; and there is one very odd thing about the Puritan instinct—their insensibility to æsthetics.

I don't forget how much we in England and Scotland owe to the Puritan instincts. At one time, indeed, unless its narrow and severe standard had been raised, there would have been very little religion or morality left in the country; so that I do really understand and sympathise with the Puritan feeling that proclaimed, in season and out of season, that nothing but Conduct and the fear of God was of any importance.

278. Men forsake Conduct for Pleasure, the fear of God for the love of self, far too soon.

We need the Puritan spirit, but Puritanism is not all. I do say there is something about the Exeter Hall folk—dear, good creatures—like the foxes with their tails off; or like the colour-blind man who is shown a colour, and you say, "That is green, very green," and he looks, and says, "To me it looks brown." Of course he never saw, and never will see green. And a

man who has no ear for music hears a tune, and you say, "That tune is 'Pop goes the Weasel,'" but he says, "I don't believe it; in my opinion it is 'God save the Queen!'" You cannot talk to these people; you cannot persuade them that they know nothing about it. Why? Because there is nothing you can appeal to in them: *the faculty is left out of their composition.*

279. So you cannot make a Puritan think that the drama has anything except what belongs to the devil about it, or that music apart from hymns is a pursuit for any but godless people. Why? Because they have the art instincts left out of their composition.

280. Then, I say, we find fault with the mixed amusements of the people—we, the clergy, the Dissenters and the Church of England—we find fault with the amusements of the people. But what have we done to lead them to anything better?

This is what I often ask myself.

I don't mean to say you can turn your churches and chapels into places of social re-

creation. That is not the cause for which they exist; but I do say there might be a great deal more sympathy on the part of the clergy with the recreations of the people. You might give them a chance. Surround them with wholesome conditions; and, if you want them to keep out of vice and crime, give them something else to do.

If you give the human heart nothing to grind, it will grind itself; something it must have. Then, I ask, why do not the so-called spiritual directors of the people try more how they might meet, or allow for, the ordinary human wants of the people, before condemning them.

If you give a man a tract when he wants food, a little theology when he wants music or recreation, you give him the wrong thing. He wants bread, and you give him a stone; he wants a fish, and you give him a scorpion.

It is all very well meant, but it does not answer, so I say: Let us see on the part of Dissenters and Church of England ministers more sympathy with the recreations of the people.

Let us even throw open our churches some-

times for music, and let us have the great oratorios, organ voluntaries, and other sacred musical performances, at fitting times in the church, and let the people come in.

What can be better than to listen to elevating music in church? Where did the oratorios begin? They began in the chapel of St. Philip Neri, at Rome, in 1540. The good Father found that the young people liked music, and were attracted to church by it, and he gave it to them.

There is a lesson for us. The church adapting itself to the wants of its people, being a helper of their joy.

281. In old days the church used to be a kind of home for the people, and the pastor used to be the friend of the people. The doors of the church were always open, and when there was war or trouble outside, the people used to flock in, and bring their valuables, and little ones, and sit down in the sanctuary, and often the church was a real sanctuary to them.

It was a great recreator too. They looked forward to its offices, among other things, as a great spectacular resource. I am reminded of

this whenever I see the common people abroad kneeling before their gaudy altars, or assisting at their picturesque services. What to us is gaudy, is solemn and impressive to them. It contrasts with the meanness of their homes feeds their imaginations, and recreates their thoughts. Pictures, painting, music, processions, all this stimulates and varies their lives, and of old, the churches throughout Christendom were full of magnificent pageantry.

The great "Miracle Plays" took place there. The church was the seat and sanctifier of both music and the drama. People forget this when they abuse the drama. Yet the modern drama began in the Christian church, and all the great miracle plays were a sort of semi-religious and semi-social instruction and recreation for the people. People forget this when they lock their churches against everything but the liturgy and the pulpit.

282. Think of how we are pushed for room here, in this great city. Everything for which the church can reverently be used, the church should reverently be used. For sacred music, for lectures of instruction and general knowledge, for teaching and classes, as abroad.

Think of these great dismal City churches, empty and useless for the most part except on Sunday.

A side chapel in St. Paul's Cathedral is indeed used for ecclesiastical business by the bishop. A few churches are used for oratorios, a semi-secular lecture here and there takes place, and catechising school-children from the pulpit is not uncommon.

283. I am glad that organ-recitals are coming into fashion in churches. Exeter Hall and the Albert Hall ought to be thrown open on Sundays for the people, and a good organist engaged. At the Albert Hall the admissions on that day should be down to threepence, with a reserved area if you will. It would pay, and it would do good.

284. Our Nonconformist brethren do a great deal more with their chapels than we do with our Churches. There is a great deal more homely and sound feeling about our Dissenting brethren.

The Church is too frigid. We Church clergy ought to shake the starch out of our neckties.

285. You know it is impossible and undesirable that the clergy of the Church should take exactly the lead in popular amusements; they have their own sphere, and that is not amusement; but we want them to be fairly in sympathy with all that is human and wholesome.

We don't want to turn churches into playhouses, or places for any kind of noisy gatherings. All we want is for the clergy and the religious world to be fairly humane and reasonable, and above all we want them not *to stop the way.*

286. We don't want the very little advance or struggle there is on the part of the people for education or recreation immediately to be checked in the name of religion.

That is the sort of thing that makes religion unpopular, gives the Church a bad name, and drives people into opposite camps.

287. I shall live to see a change in all this old world narrowness. I shall live to see the clergy taking the poor man by the hand, and helping him to his joy and elevation here below, instead of merely having an eye to his eternal welfare.

Why I hope to see the day when the British Museum and the other great institution at South Kensington will be opened on Sundays, and not only open to the people, but also open in connection with competent lecturers, for it is of no use to go and look at things without a notion of what they mean. You ought to have somebody there to explain to you in little groups what is to be seen.

I often go into the British Museum, that dead and alive place, where so many labels are upside down, and where so much that is fit to be seen is out of sight. Still it is a splendid place, and there are magnificent things, if you could only see them.

I went to it the other day to see something, and when I found it, it was in a corner and the label on its face, so I came away not much wiser.

There are leading men amongst us who would be glad to pioneer the working classes over their special departments.

288. Suppose we had Sir Henry Thompson or Professor Flower to go with us round the College of Surgeons' Museum, that splendid museum of

comparative anatomy, full of bones and skeletons, and specimens which look so extremely tedious and uninteresting to the eye at first. Suppose he were to come, and show you why all these skeletons were arranged in rows, the skeletons of different animals, and pointed out the grand unity of the framework of organic life, showing how all the articulations and joints can be traced, through hand, or foot, or fin, or flap, or wing, down and down in beautiful order, through the skeletons of the lower animals, until you perceive that what at first is most unlike a human framework has the most curious affinity with it, through a certain unity of design, varied by climate, pursuits, the pressure of necessity, and the gradual evolution of characteristic forms and qualities. Here the tail is developed, there checked, and we find only the rudimentary caudal appendage.

Here one finger or claw is prolonged, there all are dwarfed, here all are webbed together, there two have grown into one, whilst others have almost if not quite disappeared, but in each case the same framework is to be traced. Professor Flower at the College of Surgeons showed me this, and along with it came a

new flood of thoughts and interests flowing into my mind, and I only longed that others might also see the life and meaning come again upon those dry and dead bones, until the majestic animal kingdom stood lighted up before them in the radiant order of Creation's plan.

289. You are fully alive to, and have heard all the arguments which can be advanced against opening museums on Sundays. The favourite, but oft-repeated argument about the Sabbath —the thin end of the wedge argument, the people 'don't care' cry, &c.

But what is the great argument? Why won't the good people let us go into the museums? Why, they say that it will involve the breaking up of the rest of so many other people. In other words, *compulsory labour.*

290. Now remember what the answer is to that. The answer is twofold. The first answer is *voluntary agency*, the second answer is *combination.*

Let me explain.

We are told that so many museum officials and servants will be deprived of their day of

rest; but in all these cases where we purpose to let people into museums and galleries, voluntary agency may be organised to a very great extent: that is to say, you people who are practically at leisure, or do little or nothing all the week, will willingly come forward, and take the place of overworked and underpaid officials on Sunday. You might have a great system of voluntary agency to an extent hitherto quite unknown and unrealised.

291. If we could once get these places open, gentlemen would come forward, men of leisure or semi-leisure, and many hard workers in other spheres would find their rest and recreation in superintending the wholesome instruction and recreation of the people on Sunday.

For their religious culture, there is ample, if not over-congenial provision already made.

292. In the second place, there is *combination*. You must remember there is not much fear of either officials, omnibus drivers, or cab drivers, being overworked, or of houses of refreshment being opened in the immediate neighbourhood of museums in too great numbers.

In many cases, no doubt, people going to

these places might want a vehicle, or some kind of refreshment, but the kind of people most likely to go to museums on Sunday would probably be those who could ill afford to buy refreshments: they would take their refreshments with them, and manage to eat them going or coming. You watch excursionists, and see how they manage "solvitur ambulando." We need not lay much stress on the opening of places of refreshment. You provide the "feast of reason and the flow of soul," and let the flow of beer take care of itself.

In fact this great nightmare of toiling Sunday slaves that rises before the objectors is one peculiar to the Sabbatarian imagination.

Thousands would travel on foot, thousands would not have far to go. People who walk daily five miles out to work and five miles back think nothing of distance. But if they have to come from afar, a certain number of omnibuses and cabs, tramways and metropolitan cars, would be required; but directly the drivers think themselves overworked, don't you think they would "strike"?

293. Do you suppose, with experience of the

past, that the British workman can't take care of himself? It seems to me he takes precious good care of himself. The only difficulty is to get him to take care of you.

Therefore I have no fear. I don't think the British artisan or workman will want the religious people to come forward and protect him in the assertion of his rights, or what he conceives to be his rights, on or off the Lord's day. He can and will protect himself.

Englishmen like that way best. They like independence, and they like sympathy and advice, but I don't think they like over-legislation, and I am sure it is not good for them. They like to make up their own minds on their own affairs, and have all the information we can give them, but they don't want any of your fussy interference.

294. In these days the leaders of the people, those who think for them and direct them, are not always wise, and they are not always experienced men; but they are often in communication with those who are wise, who do know, and in the long run, believe me, although there may be much suffering in these struggles between work-

men and masters in the long run the people will do what is right. They are gradually fighting out, and winning for themselves a kind of standpoint, which will clear the ground, through present suffering, for future generations. Nothing either solid or good was ever done without a battle.

We have heard something of arbitration and mediation. I am all in favour of it when it carries public opinion, but I am against it when it does not, and it usually comes too late. It is no use mediating between two classes who don't really want you.

Popular instruction is more needed than mediation.

Look at radical and temperance lectures, what an effect they produce on the people.

Popular lectures on Sunday, explaining what is known of political economy, and the principles of supply and demand, would often avert strikes. The men don't really know, and the masters don't explain clearly what is known, until too late.

295. But we are not all intellect, any more than we are all bones and muscle.

We have an emotional side, and whilst the affections are doubtless the great restorers, the imagination, the artistic and dramatic instincts must not be neglected. They are amongst the most powerful recreators, better than physic, beer, or the police.

296. I think in this busy, hard life, the great value of the artistic and dramatic instincts, and the power of imagination to soothe, to heal, to restore, and to purify, has been wofully left out of account.

I think there is an immense future for popular art, and music, and drama.

Popular literature we have already found out, and that is something, but it is only a mixed recreator.

Reading demands a certain deterrent exertion in itself, but Art is the expression for us of thoughts and feelings, and it not only expresses, it kindles them. You will bear me out that there is often an immense relief in having some thought or feeling which has been weighing upon our minds clearly and beautifully expressed. Sometimes the heart almost leaps to the lips. "That is just what I thought, that is what

I feel—how true, how lovely!" It may not be exactly the words you would have used, but it is what you feel, and you need the artist to express it for you. It may be done through picture or poem, oration or drama, but there will ever remain the deep need for adequate expression, and the sphere of the artist is eternal.

297. All art is thus enormously recreative, but this vast sustaining and civilizing power is very much left out of account by those people who want chiefly to do good. They seem to forget that the people have imaginations, emotions, and love for beauty, and a certain deep need of excitement which must be met somehow. They want to feel life, and to stir its stagnant waters. Any one who will help them to that will win them and rule them. He who finds an entrance into their imaginations, he who appeals to their emotions, will have an immense power for helping them, for ruling them, and for recreating them.

298. Well, music, painting, and the drama does this. And for direct appeal to emotion, music stands alone as an agent. It needs no inter-

preter, no painter, no poet, no actor. You may sit apart by yourself, silent, preoccupied, and hearing some strain of music. The cloud will be suddenly lifted from your soul; you seem to be floated away to some distant region, far from your pain; you forget what has harassed you and worried you. All that has been carried away by the waves of sound, and when the music ceases you wonder at the change that has passed over you.

What has taken place? The music shakes through the drum of the ear the nervous centres of the body, and through these the emotions have been directly dealt with. The internal atmosphere has been shifted to and fro, the sluggish mood winnowed and lifted up, and you feel a kind of buoyancy, such as is sometimes imparted to you by a walk, or a chat with a friend, or in various ways we cannot pause to consider.

But in each case the mind has been braced, aroused: we are ourselves again, and ready for work or play.

Somehow music has the direct power of doing this for us, as though by magic.

299. It is wonderful to notice the effect of

music on large crowds. I have sometimes watched in the great Promenade Concerts at Covent Garden the people come in different moods. Some noisy or talking, others calm or stupid.

After some time the music begins to tell, and you will find a wave of influence pass over the crowd, and some matchless performer or some song has had the power of entrancing this motley throng.

In the dance music led by Strauss or Gung' you might see the whole crowd begin to sway together with a sort of rhythmical motion.

In the violin or cornet solos they would gradually come to a standstill and remain motionless, letting the beneficent influence of some angelic spirit, as it were, sweep over them, and refresh their minds. Have you never seen that?

I say music has an enormous power for re-creating people. I am for multiplying bands. Bands in the Parks, bands on Hampstead Heath, bands in the Squares.

The people would flock, and it would do them good. They would forget the beershop in fine weather, and that would do them good too.

But the weather is not always fine. I am

for vast sheltered enclosures. The Aquarium, as an example. I want to see great Winter Gardens for the people, where they can and will take their wives and families, and hear good music or good acting, just as they do in foreign countries, sitting down and sipping their coffee, or taking their glass of ale without guile.

300. If you associate eating and drinking with things which expand the heart and the imagination, you will do away with half the drinking. What does drinking often mean? It means that people have nothing to do but to drink, it is their one amusement; but if you give them something else to think about, in nine cases out of ten they won't drink more than is good for them.

301. And here let me say a word about Art generally, and its popular functions.

Some people are always bothering their heads about the functions of Art, and asking whether it is intended to make people better? Of course it is intended to make people better. Everything good is intended to make people better; but they want to know whether Art is intended

to teach morals, whether Art is a moral and religious thing in itself? Of course it is not.

302. The primary function of Art is an expression medium, neither moral nor immoral.

You may have very good Art, that is, the perfect expression of human feeling, in finely dramatic situations, very good Art and very bad morals, and you may have very good morals indeed, and very bad Art.

So that you see Art is not in itself intended primarily to teach morality at all. The parson is intended to teach that, and Art is intended to be simply expressive of the varied emotions, susceptibilities, passions, and imaginations of the human heart.

Of course it has points of contact with morals. Everything has. Of course it moves ever between the poles of right and wrong. It ought to be directed towards the expression of what is noble and good, just as everything else ought to be, but not more than everything else.

303. Morals move on a different plane from what we call Art yet. The two planes may constantly intersect each other.

Friendship and arithmetic are different things. The affectional and calculating spheres are distinct, but they may meet for all that, and for good or for evil,—for you may swindle your friend out of his money, or you may assist your friend in a business speculation. But friendship is not intended to teach arithmetic, nor arithmetic friendship.

Each moves upon its own plane, and so Art is not intended to teach morals nor morals Art. Each moves upon its own plane.

304. I say let us enjoy Art, and make the best use we can of it. Art is for enjoyment, and the wholesome enjoyment of Art is intended to keep in working order the whole man. It repairs brain-waste, sharpens the emotions, kindles the imagination, and develops the social instincts and æsthetic perceptions.

305. Some people tell us that the people do not care for Art, or for the Drama, or for Music. I don't believe it. You might just as well tell me that the people don't care for turtle-soup. Of course they do when they can get it. The popular instinct for beauty comes out in a thou-

sand odd ways, if you watch for it. I will tell you an incident that happened in a certain country parish with which I am well acquainted.

306. There was a little model cottage set up by the rector's family, just to show how pretty and cheap a poor man's cottage might be made. It was whitewashed, and painted, and hung with pictures, and there were several common little ornaments in it. The people used to come in constantly and look at the place, and when they went home to their own dismal rooms, they felt the contrast, and they soon began to try the effect of a little whitewash, and then a little paint, and a great deal of soap and water upon their own houses; and some of the women got hold of some prints and pictures, and when the men came home there was something to look at, and something to do, and soon they all turned to improving their houses after work hours. Instead of getting drunk and beating their wives, the men took a turn at the pail and the whitewash.

Well, that is not the point. The point was this, that in the window of this little cottage there was a white porcelain hand. I don't much ad-

mire these white hands, they always seem to me as if they came out of a dissecting-room, but many people seem to think that they are very pretty things, and certainly the human hand is a very beautiful object in itself. Well, this hand stood on the window-sill inside, so that all who passed by on the road could see it. Now there was a poor man who went by to his work every day, and as often as he passed he looked at the white hand, until by some kind of fascination it seemed to beckon him on; and one night, I am sorry to say, the house was broken into, and the poor thief, who had passed too often for his peace, did not take any other things away, although there were many more valuable than the little white hand, but he took the hand.

And then you say people don't care for art. The poor fellow was had up before the magistrate, hand and all. The man had nothing to say for himself, except that he did not mean to sell the hand, he only wanted to keep it. An ideal lady's hand was to him a thing of irresistible beauty.

How many things have men done and suffered for ladies' hands since the world began!

Well, the worthy magistrate heard the tale.

He was so much touched at the man's simple devotion to Art, that he let him off easy. I hardly know which I like best, the man or the magistrate. You do not give the people credit for those art-instincts which require guidance and cultivation, but which for good or evil always have been, and always will be, so powerful to attract, to elevate, or to degrade.

307. Look for a moment at the people's literature. Look at the popularity of that remarkable organ of public opinion, the *Police News*. The pictures are the real attraction. They are certainly not what you call high art. They are coarse and sometimes powerful; they make you shudder. That is to say, they appeal to the dramatic instincts.

Some people want to suppress the *Police News*, but if you suppress the *Police News* you must give people something instead. I should prefer to see the *Police News* reformed rather than abolished, when I see the intense delight it gives to people. They go up, and have a good look in at the shop window, and then they go in and spend their penny, in order to carry away the pictures.

You object to those pictures. Some are truly vile, but it is not all horrid murders, drunken maniacs, and screaming women.

There is the noble fireman rescuing a household in the lurid midnight, lit up with fearful flames.

There is the gallant sailor plunging in to save a man overboard.

There is the felon's doom—the conscience-stricken man in Newgate, the white-tied and benevolent parson, the dreadful hangman—images not without a sound and lasting moral.

Up and down wild life is catered for no doubt, but the stirring scenes, if they do nothing else, lift the dull imagination out of the weary routine and grinding toil of life.

308. I doubt whether the *Police News* tempts to much evil. It is stimulating, but chiefly to the imagination. The cheap bad novels are far worse, and far more dangerous to youth. But the *Police News*, like every other varied and vivid picture of real life, though little to our taste, is far from an unmixed evil; and whatever there is unwholesome about it, through it the imagination is exercised, and the people forget themselves.

After all, it is something besides beer, and it has amused them, sometimes leaving with them a thought deterrent of sin, or encouraging to virtue, bravery, and manliness.

It is our business to watch and train these low risings of the art-instinct. The stream well guided will fertilise and beautify the lives of the lower orders.

Even tracts are good, when they have got pictures, and though a few wise tracts without pictures have done some good, many silly tracts with pictures have done more.

To *one* who *reads* the tract on drunkenness, one hundred will look at the picture of the incorrigible drunkard, dragged off to prison, and pursued by hooting boys, and for the first time see himself as others see him. And wherein is that different from the moral often conveyed by the *Police News?*

309. I would multiply pictures of all kinds for the people—of trades, of travels, of places; scenes domestic and foreign; scenes from books, stories and characters from the Bible, from Shakespeare.

Children like pictures. I have often thought that if we could go to the houses of the poor,

and give them some of the picture books which delight the children of the upper classes, the "Old Fairy Tales with New Faces," by Walter Crane, and Marcus Ward's publications, they would destroy them, dog's-ear and tear them, distribute them in pieces through a whole alley, but what a resource! What an opening of the young mind in new directions. What a relief to mothers. What enjoyment, what absorbed attention amongst the little gutter-groups. Go you forth, and help the people to pictures and the children to playthings.

310. This is one of the things good people do not do, and the consequence is that the people who are not good step in and do it for them. This is why I say to the good people, instead of abusing, and bullying, and knocking about those who are, after all, trying to meet the real wants of the people, let them come forward and enter heartily into the popular instincts.

311. You say the people don't care for pictures and beautiful things. I say, try them. Now, do you suppose they don't care for the drama? Why look at Punch and Judy. I declare that show

is so fascinating, that I can never pass it by myself. You all know that piece of high art. It is the best dramatic art that is open to the great mass of the people as they pass to and fro.

Some poor weary fellow, trudging home from his day's work, shoulders his bag, and takes a turn at Punch and Judy, at the corner of the street.

He loves to see Toby backing up Punch, and he does not observe the profound contempt with which Toby eyes the crowd, but he only sees that there is a fight going on—something which calls out his emotions, and kindles up the dramatic sense, and he watches that familiar drama to the bitter end.

Well, now see how often in this humble form Punch and Judy teaches the great principles of sound morality.

This bad man, Punch, not without a certain *bonhomie* and popular fibre, who has at last lost every sense of decency and propriety, comes before us as a kind of chartered libertine in full career.

He kills his wife, throws his children out of the window, bullies or murders every one who opposes him, evades the laws, outwits the sheriff,

and finally strings him up in his place on the gallows.

And yet to all this there is a deeper moral, for at last we behold the clever villain whom no human justice could reach trembling like a frightened child before the terrors of the unseen world, as symbolised by the ghost of one of his victims that haunts him.

312. I declare, then, that quite apart from its recreative nature, the drama, even in its humblest form, may be a moral teacher.

I don't know whether I quite agree with Mr. Boucicault's recent letter. I am not quite sure whether I think the Prime Minister ought to pardon all the Fenian gentlemen and set them at liberty, simply because some people like that play in which some such event is thought desirable. I have not made up my mind, but I think Mr. Boucicault has been a little premature. I do not think it follows, because a large audience like to see a generous and free-hearted man forgiven, although he has done, and may do things dangerous to society, that they would therefore wish the Prime Minister at once to liberate all those generous-

hearted patriots whose vocation it seems to be to keep the Emerald Isle in a constant ferment.

But that is not a question which I shall deal with to-night. Indirectly the drama is a practical power as well as a religious power, and perhaps that is all Mr. Boucicault meant. But *directly* the drama ought not to exist to teach politics any more than morals. It may teach them, and will do so indirectly and powerfully, simply because the most absorbing and thrilling and interesting situations of life are inseparably wrapped up with politics, religion, and the general moralities of life, but I should be sorry to see the stage turned into a propaganda of any kind. How dangerous and disastrous such a practice might be! Supposing Mr. Boucicault were to write a play to prove that all the clergy of the Established Church ought immediately to be hanged because they don't like the Nonconformists. I should object, first because I do like the Nonconformists. I think about them exactly as I think about anybody else. If they are unpleasant people I don't like them, but if they are pleasant and agreeable people, I never recollect that they are Nonconformists. Secondly, I should object because I don't think

we ought to hang people who happen to differ from us in their opinions. Then lastly, of course, I object because I don't want to be hanged myself; so that for these three reasons I should object to the principle advocated by Mr. Boucicault, that plays may be written to establish certain opinions, which opinions should be at once acted upon by the Prime Minister or the Home Secretary.

313. But who that has looked upon a first-rate drama by Shakespeare, or Sheridan, or Goldsmith, has failed to derive great instruction as well as amusement? Mr. Boucicault himself has written some fine and brave things, and so has Mr. Tom Taylor. Some time ago I was looking at that matchless actor, Mr. Jefferson. I saw him in Mr. Boucicault's "Rip Van Winkle." I said, "What a lesson is there, what a powerful teaching of art, what an expression of the emotions." How everybody was kindled and held by that repulsive subject, and by the genius of the actor and of the playwright. How the stages of that drama corresponded to some of the deepest thoughts and feelings of human beings.

314. In the first part Rip comes on a sort of reckless ne'er-do-well victim of drink, and all through the last part he comes on a loathsome and decrepit old beggar-man. He is "got-up" in the most dilapidated and repulsive manner, and yet for three or four hours the audience is entranced. Why? Because they are recreated by a spectacle which will ever stir and recreate the human heart, that of its own foibles, generosities, and follies, its own experience, its own conclusions, tried and presented outwardly, in a spectacle terribly familiar and true to life.

This is what at once restrains and elevates. We are lifted up, our perceptions are sharpened, we get a glimpse into the workings of temptation. We see the heart bared. We learn indirectly great lessons.

315. The first great lesson we learn from "Rip Van Winkle," for instance, is that the drunkard is not as some people seem to imagine, a wholly bad man, but that he may have a great many good points, a generous and kindly nature, through which it is possible to raise him. He is not all bad, but weak.

He draws us in spite of ourselves. We are

glad to see the genial face and the sweet smile, and we weep for "Rip," and we say, "Poor fellow, how is he to be saved? can he be saved?" And then we watch breathlessly the downward career of that man, and how he wears out his wife, and reduces his children to the verge of starvation, without ever losing their love.

We weep over the man as he is dragged back again by this demon of drink. It comes home to many hearts every night. There are people who have friends, fathers, sons, who are going the same way.

I venture to say that amongst all the temperance lecturers of the day, Mr. Jefferson has been a more eloquent preacher of sobriety than any.

316. Those terrible nightly sermons of his before the footlights have smitten through many hearts. It breaks up the hearts of the people to be shown in that subtle way the real strength and weakness of human nature, and the Nemesis of its frailty. It is just so powerful because it is just so true. The man in the midst of his weakness is so lovable at times that we long to reclaim him, and many a man sees there a

portrait of himself, and I do believe he goes home a sadder and wiser and a better man than before.

317. I need not remind this audience of the impersonations of Mr. Irving, than whom no man has ever portrayed more powerfully the intense and weary unrest of crime.

One may object or not to the melodramatic form of the "Bells," or "Eugene Aram," but the finer shades of human feeling are all there. The vague memory of a better life, the haunting sense of wrong committed. The passionate desire to be free from self, and the burden of self. The gleams of native goodness that no failure or past wickedness can utterly obliterate. All these subtle elements woven into a consummate unity of expression by consummate art, and relieved by those prodigious bursts of dramatic passion of which Mr. Irving is so great a master. These things are familiar to us all as household words, and the higher impersonations from Shakespeare and Tennyson have of late increased the debt of all earnest moralists and lovers of art to Mr. Irving, with whose noble address to the clergy I conclude this part of my lecture.

"Gentlemen, change your attitude towards the stage, and believe me the stage will co-operate with your work of faith and labour of love. It will help you in disarming and decimating the forces which make for moral evil, and in implanting and fostering the seeds and energies of moral good."*

318. And here I would fain dwell upon music as a recreation for the people, but I have treated this copiously elsewhere. If barrel-organs are to be put down, the people must have better street music. I plead for bands in open spaces, and more of them, for popular singing classes organised in schoolrooms and mission churches, for cheap oratorios and cheap concerts. The clergy should lead these movements. Every parish should be musically organised, and every waste place of common musically utilized.

319. And now I have held you too long, and I must draw to a close, but let me remind you, ere we part, that no outward facilities for recreation will do you any good unless you have certain inward capacities.

* Paper read in Shoreditch Town Hall, at the Church of England Temperance Conference, 31st March, 1876.

Are you a person who cannot be amused? Is vice your only joy? Are you dead to healthy and natural pleasures?

Only a manageable state can be managed, and you must keep yourselves fit for enjoyment, just as you must keep yourselves fit for work.

320. I see young men recreating themselves in just the very way which destroys in them the capacity for all recreation.

Look at the man of pleasure. A very dressy man forsooth, who goes out with a jaunty "devil-may-care" air to enjoy himself. Invariably he is the most frivolous, and perhaps the most miserable of all men, because he has lost his capacity for enjoyment.

What is the thought that comes up when people talk of "a rake"? At once we think of a man who cannot enjoy, and has exhausted all the springs of natural happiness, who is going about as a sort of moral beggar, trying all the pleasures of life, varying, exaggerating, distorting them, and asking them only to yield up some of the pristine sweetness which once sent a thrill through his unspoiled heart, before he was dead in the midst of life, worn out before his time.

Well, we see the young men of the period, after a day of hard work behind desk or counter, rushing off into the wildest excesses, and waking up the next morning, not only unfit for their work, but unfit for any form of wholesome enjoyment.

321. I say, keep pure within you that unsullied spring of health and sensibility which, once gone, requires a long and painful discipline to get back, if ever it can be got back at all. The key to pleasure is honest work. All dishes taste good with that sauce. All things come *àpropos* to a man who, in the homely words of the catechism, does his duty in that state of life to which it has pleased God to call him.

He keeps his palate clean, his appetite healthy, his eye single, and his whole body full of light.

OBITER DICTA.

OBITER DICTA.

322 Questions for Solution.
323 The Nature of Communion.
324 The Divinity of Christ.
325 The Moral Government of the World.
326 Positive and Relative Morality.
327 Unity of Worship.
328 The Sabbath.

VIII.

OBITER DICTA.

NO one is more conscious than I am of the obstinate questionings that must from time to time have arisen in the reader's mind as he perused the first portion of this volume.

Questions press for solution at every point. Although I cannot hope to discuss them here, I may fitly close this volume by suggesting a few of them, together with hints for answers to be worked out by the reader, or left as food for future discussion. Even to state the difficulties that we may not be able to answer often relieves the overburdened mind, and helps us to see more clear.

The Nature of Communion.

323. The nature of communion between God the Oversoul, immanent in the universe, and man the soul, immanent in the body.—Every new revelation of science, showing the subtle effects of light, heat, electricity, magnetism; every new study in psychology, revealing the strange mental affinities by which brain affects brain, and thought-waves pass to and fro; nay, the common mystery which shrouds the transmission of thought by speech, or the invisible contact of air-waves through space upon the tympanum of the ear, will supply us with analogies, helping us to understand how a Divine Power may use means to control the telegraph-wires of the brain, and transmit messages which are holy thoughts and impulses.

How doubly secure will be our feelings in prayer, how safe our religious consciousness, if the rationale of Divine communion is seen to be not more difficult to conceive than that of human speech, or the silent converse so often realised of mind *en rapport* with mind.

The Divinity of Christ.

324. I should like to dwell once more upon

the authoritative nature of the revelation of supreme love and righteousness made to man in Jesus Christ.

I think it so important for those who are driven from Christianity by the hard and bald statement, unexplained and unqualified, that Jesus Christ is the Almighty God, made man and then crucified, to remember in what sense alone such a statement is at all intelligible in the present day. I have always explained the Divinity of Christ thus.

There must be infinite ranges in the Divine Being's relations to our world, aspects and energies of Him that can never be comprehended under the limitations of humanity. But there is in Him a human aspect, like the bright side of a planet: that side is turned towards man, expressed outwardly to man—in man, and fully expressed in the Man Jesus Christ. In Him we had a true inflowing of God into human nature. As true God as the sea is true sea when it flows into a limited gulf. Not all God was in Jesus, yet all that was in Jesus was God, under the necessary human limitations. As He said, "My Father is greater than I."

As I do not know what the human spirit is, neither do I know what the Divine Spirit is. Both can be felt, but neither can be defined, except very vaguely and generally as Power guiding Force, to act upon matter.

I am unable therefore to define like the schoolmen the way in which a human body was used by God in Christ; but I accept His account of Himself, as far as I can gather it, as the Son of God. I accept the impression of Divine life and mind which He has left upon the stream of history, as far as I can see it, as authoritative, because it seems to me that Christianity is the revelation of those ultimate moral and spiritual principles, incarnated in a Divine and human life, which alone bind human society together, whilst they secure the progress of mind and body, and satisfy the unconquerable instincts and aspirations of the spirit.

In the above statements it is quite possible that all the various heresies which have from time to time exercised the Church have not been successfully avoided; but it is after all a poor ambition to steer within the smooth waters of orthodox theology, whilst the vessel

of religion itself is going down beyond the harbour bar. The power of Christ is to be felt, not explained.

He who brings man into best and widest accord with the will of the universe, shows him best what is his place there, and teaches him to rise ever higher and higher towards the infinite source of his being, He it is who is the revelation of my Lord and my God, the Son of the Father that taketh away the sins of the world.

But such is the elasticity of words and ideas in the realm of theological metaphysics, that I believe almost any statement of mine could, by the kind of ingenuity common amongst professional theologians, be brought within the proper lines of accepted opinion, should it seem worth while to do so,—a pitiful waste of time, to be sure.

It is important to observe that the Divine revelation of Christ is not injured by the fact that Christianity was, historically speaking, a reaction against Jewish Phariseeism and Sadduceeism on the one hand, and Pagan idolatries on the other. The gospel received a special impress, an accidental form, from the age and country in which it was first preached.

Its transitory features, local illustrations and omissions as to art, politics, and science, have been amply and ably pointed out; all which things do not hinder it from being the universal religion, because when properly handled it seeks not to destroy but to fulfil, and is capable of retaining in every form of religion, past, present, or to come, all that is morally true and spiritually valuable. It can do this, because the teaching of Christ does not deal with rules or exhaust subjects, but with principles, because Christianity is not a letter but a spirit, not a dogmatic theology, but a heavenly life. If the quality of a life be Divine, it little matters what art or politics or science may flow into it; they will not absorb it,—it will absorb them, and like the seed fed by earth and air and water, it will grow by that it feeds on.

THE MORAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.

325. The belief of all others most precious to practical life, and most rudely shaken of late, is undoubtedly a belief in the moral government of the universe. Our ideas of goodness and justice are often outraged by what we see daily going on under a supposed providen-

tial rule. Not only are there no interpositions to save the weak and innocent from the strong or wicked, but cruelty and misery seem stamped indelibly upon the animal world, whilst the laws of climate, accident, and disease, inflict untold misery upon countless human beings.

In short, a terrible indictment might be, in fact has been, drawn up by John Stuart Mill against the dispensations of Providence. And yet goodness, justice, and love seem to lose their Divine sanction if they have not their source in the highest wisdom. The great problem of the world's misery presses hard at times upon all of us. The following considerations may tend to show us that, if not solved, it may not be unsolvable, and indeed may even here be partly solved.

1st. A state of progress is always one of imperfection, and imperfection means less good, or comparative evil; hence various kinds of evil and misery. This may seem to remove the difficulty only one step back. Why is imperfection allowed? Why, at all events in the moral world, have not sentient creatures been made and kept good? leaving the animal world, of which we know next to nothing. Is God

unjust because men are allowed to be bad? To this I reply:

Sin is the result of that freedom of choice which constitutes us reasonable agents. Take away responsibility, and you reduce men to puppets. A human being is able to rise because he is able to fall; his peculiar glory is that he must attain unto glory, and the process of attainment may be temporary failure, and pains of various kinds may hang about the steps of progress, but it may still be well that *all* may be placed within the reach of eternal life, the essence of whose worth is that it is chosen, and can be, must be, won.

2nd. Note that we see but a moment of time and only a very few facts. Upon these facts we may draw hasty conclusions; as a man who sees a wise surgeon cutting off the leg of a screaming patient might mistake him for a murderer.

The pain incidental to the lower state may be rectified in a higher one. Give God the margin of eternity and He will justify Himself.

This is said to be arguing that because things are so bad here therefore they will be better hereafter. But we don't ground our hopes of

justice hereafter on the injustice of this life, but upon the constitution of our nature, our inward affinities to the Oversoul of God, by which we discern so much that points to goodness, wisdom, and love, as the highest and all-conquering law.

For, as Mr. Matthew Arnold observes, we perceive not only that by an order impressed upon matter everything fulfils steadily the law of its own being, but also that there is a law working throughout the world of human nature which makes for righteousness. This law, impressed by a thousand pains and failures upon human society, involves the steady and increasing cultivation of love, justice, mercy, and truth amongst men; and it is not too much to say that the world has slowly been driven into a recognition of the divineness of these qualities by the impossibility of framing society permanently without them.

Is it strange that what man has learned with such difficulty he should enthrone in the highest heaven, and that nothing can long or permanently shake the deep conviction that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all; and that God is love, and *that* notwithstanding the pains and cruelties seen in a momentary glimpse

of a transitory and embryo world, "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him."

Lastly, much of the pain and misery of life comes from the violation of the fixed and beneficent laws; but a moment's thought will teach us that it is better for us to find out and obey wise laws than for those laws to be uncertain in their operation. Fire always burns, and sometimes it will burn your house down and you in it, but even that is better than that fire should not always burn.

We may abuse pain, and think our lot cruel, but as far as I see, almost all the human misery around me has been caused by neglect, ignorance, and vice; whilst almost all the progress and happiness in the world is due to the effort we instinctively make to escape from pain and misery.

Pain is the herald of progress, and want is the author of industry, commerce, and the diffusion of happiness.

If everything now known about health and morals were acted upon, the civilized world would have little to complain of in a very few generations.

We are being goaded into happiness by the severe but the strong and tender hand of God.

Positive and Relative Morality.

326. Relative morality is a question which in the coming time will occupy a vast deal of attention. It is not true to say that morals are matters of taste and custom. Morals run in certain directions, and always will run in the same directions. But the same principles of truth, purity, justice, will be interpreted differently in different ages, and the virtues themselves will be susceptible of a different order of arrangement—valour being thought most of in one age, truth in another, purity in another, according to the needs or culture of the age. Christianity, by reversing the order of virtues adopted by the old world, subduing the aggressive and exalting the passive virtues, has disclosed for all time the secret springs of moral and spiritual life, and built up an ideal of human character upon an impregnable, because a spiritual, foundation. But many details have from age to age to be modified, so that, as Mr. Sidgwick says, it may in transition ages be best for individuals to do things which it is

also best positively to condemn them for doing, as when a tyrant is dethroned, or friends poison a man with opiates, to save him a few hours of agony. There is still plenty of work for the moral casuist in applying general principles to particular cases, and his task in these days is not an easy one.

Again, we must learn not to condemn hastily the imperfect moral codes of the past, or place them in opposition to our revised methods. They were good in their day, and in the *same direction as our own codes.* Let us be thankful we have got further, but let us also remember that even our moral rules, such as those that have to do with the relations of the sexes, the laws of property, laws of commerce, or the laws of war, may not be final, but only relatively good, and therefore open to further modification and amendment.

The proposition that whilst moral principles are positive, all human statements of them are relative, evidently covers an immense and absorbing field of inquiry.

Unity of Worship.

327. Many of us are beginning to feel that the

religious worship of the future will be different in fashion from any of our received and time-honoured forms. As far as I am concerned, it does not seem to me to matter much what the form is. I have learned to be almost as happy in the Roman, Greek, or Jewish churches as in the Protestant. The letter killeth and the Spirit maketh alive; and the spirit of devotion and prayer is essentially the same, whether a man believes that Christ's body is in the bread when he says his prayers, or that the Virgin hears him and helps him when he prays to heaven, or that the one God is listening, or that Christ in bodily form bows down His ear, or that saints and angels bear his prayers aloft. In all these cases the faith thus variously clothed is essentially the same.

The clothing may be fanciful or unenlightened, according to opinion and belief, but the essence of true worship is one and the same, in Greek, Catholic, Mahomedan, Hindu, or Jew.

It is belief in Divine sympathy, communion, and help; in other words, belief in something human and helpful in the unseen God.

This thought should make an enlightened and religious man able to pray in any church

or temple in which the Supreme Being is worshipped. I would not, however, thrust this habit upon all devout worshippers.

Christ would no doubt tell us that neither the mountain at Samaria nor the temple at Jerusalem could be essential to the worship of the Father. Peter might perceive that in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him; and Paul might from any heathen altar proclaim the essential unity of spiritual worship underlying all forms; but we are dependent on forms, and therefore I say, choose the best gifts, yet show I unto you a more excellent way.

I do not for a moment deny that it is of great importance to get a clear and true view of God and the soul, and as bright and high a Christian ideal as you can, and the purest attainable form of worship and praise.

All perceived error should be resisted, and the best expression of Christ's religion upheld. But the heart softens towards all religions, and the proud intellect grows very humble when it is seen that the best expression of religious truth that can ever here be reached, must, owing to the constitution of our minds, be

only a relative one; an accommodation liable to modification and restatement, and in some more heavenly state perhaps quite superseded.

Then indeed we begin to feel that religion and the perception of spiritual things is not a matter for the head, but for the inmost heart, although the head necessarily provides a mould of some kind for religion, just as the lips supply an expression often poor and inadequate enough for the emotions of the heart; and as we see how often the best things of the Spirit are hid from the wise and learned, and revealed unto babes, we become more reconciled to our own limited intelligence, and to the very decided but very contradictory opinions of many theologians, only for ourselves we had just as soon sit at the feet of Jesus and hear the gospel preached to the poor, and go into the kingdom of heaven along with the little children, as be heralded in by all the orthodoxies of the schoolmen, and vouched for by St. Athanasius himself. And I doubt not that thoughts such as these, which are daily waking up in the breasts of so many honest and earnest people, will be somehow reflected ere long in a wider teaching, in a simpler ritual, and a deeper and broader faith;

a faith enlarged by every new discovery of science, and enriched by every genuine experience, and nourished by every brotherly sympathy, and chastened by every humble sense of failure and imperfection, and yet fed by a Divine communion, and sustained by a buoyant and unfaltering trust.

Such a faith and such a ritual we may not live to see, but the Church of the future is in our hearts, as the Christ of the future was in the heart of Simeon when he took up the infant Christ in his arms.

The Sabbath.

328. A great difference of opinion seems to prevail as to what actions are right and what are wrong on Sunday. For a fuller discussion I must refer my readers to the sermon on the Lord's Day in my "Thoughts for the Times;" but I think it expedient to place again briefly the principal points. The uncertainty which prevails is bad, for people are made miserable unnecessarily, and their consciences injured, by the feeling that in doing something "secular" on Sunday they have necessarily committed a wrong action. The confusion between the

Sabbath and the Lord's Day is one great cause of this uncertainty, and half of this confusion would not take place in people's minds if they read their Bible and ecclesiastical history more carefully, or studied such a work as Dr. Hessey's Bampton Lectures on the Lord's Day. But the clergy never explain such a work from the pulpit, because they are afraid of throwing discredit on popular prejudices and Scotch Sabbatarianism, and that is considered "dangerous."

To help us to come to a right conclusion with regard to Sunday observance, let us consider first the Jewish Sabbath. This in its beginning was a touching institution. It was proclaimed by Moses to a nation of slaves, who did not know what rest was; in fact, so difficult was it found to make the slave mind take in the idea of rest, that a man had to be stoned to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath Day. Such a punishment seems hard, but it was necessary. The Duke of Wellington had a man shot for stealing a fowl during the Peninsular war. Such measures are required for rough people in rough times. There are times when needful rest must be enforced as a principle, and at some cost. As a case in point, I would allude to a

certain doctor, who, though generally advocating total abstinence from alcoholic liquors, prescribed for a literary man who *would* overwork himself, strong malt liquor in the middle of the day, so that when his patient went back to his books after his midday meal, he *could* not work, owing to the stupefying influence of the beer.

But when Christ came, He showed that even "the Sabbath or seventh day was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath;" and what we have to remember is that whilst the old Jewish Sabbath has been abolished, the law of the Sabbath Day has never been transferred authoritatively to the first day, or Sunday. Paul declared that the obligation of keeping the Sabbath was altogether abolished. Thus, in his Epistle to the Romans, while not prohibiting its observance (for he did not wish to offend the Jewish converts, who formed a large proportion of the Christians in Rome), he says: "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" (Rom. xiv. 5). And, writing to his Galatian converts, he blames them for retrograding so far as to "observe days, and months, and times, and years" (Gal. iv.

9, 19). In his letter to the Colossians, again, he tells them not to let any man judge them "in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days," since all these Jewish feasts were but "shadows" (Col. ii. 16). The Sabbath was a shadow of Christian rest and worship, but its authority passed away, and its rules were never authoritatively transferred to the Lord's Day.

Many persons in these days value the opinions of "the Fathers" very highly. Now Cyril (Bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 345) forbids his converts to observe the Sabbath day, since to do so, he said, was to turn back to Judaism. "Henceforth," he added, "reject all observance of Sabbaths, and call not meats which are really matters of indifference, unclean." Jerome (about 390) describes how the early Christians passed their time on Sunday. He says that, having been to church in the morning, they went about their ordinary work, as the making or mending of garments, &c.; and he sees no harm in their thus employing their time.

Then as to the Reformers. Luther told his co-religionists that if any one placed the observance of the glorious and refreshing day of

rest on the foundation of the Jewish Sabbath, he ordered them "to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall reprove this encroachment on the Christian spirit and liberty."

We read too that Knox, visiting Calvin on the Lord's Day, found him playing at bowls in his back garden, and neither of these good men thought there was any harm in indulging in this recreation on a Sunday.

But since the period of the English Reformation, the Sabbatical theory, confusing together Sunday and the Sabbath, has so entwined itself about us, that we fear to do anything "secular" on Sunday, even though our reason and our inner conscience tell us it is not wrong to do so.

Now what is the origin of this confusion? The Mediæval Church observed a great number of holy days, which were swept away by the great religious movement of the sixteenth century. The Reformers, however, feeling the great importance of recurring periods of rest from the toil of every-day life, when man's moral nature might be cultivated, sought to enforce the rigid observance of the Lord's Day, and with a view to this they did a most disastrous

thing—they placed the Ten Commandments in the front of the Communion Service as all of equal authority, although much that is in them concerns the Jews alone. Yet some of you who hear the Decalogue read in church, which forbids the use of horses on the Sabbath, come to church in carriages or cabs, violating thus the fourth commandment, if, that is, the word Sabbath is made to mean Sunday, as many erroneously teach. There would be no harm in having the Decalogue read through if it were explained, but it is not, and thus people often leave church quite miserable after hearing it, because they are shackled by the fetters of the Sabbatical law, which they believe that they have broken. Now how did this confusion between Sunday and the Sabbath arise? When a good cause has to be supported, people often use bad arguments on its behalf. The Reformers had a good cause—they wished to check the licentiousness of the times, and in their eagerness to save the rest and worship of the Lord's Day, whilst sweeping away a host of other holy days still observed by Rome, they employed the utterly false argument that the fourth commandment is binding on Christians, inasmuch

as that the rules for keeping the Sabbath ought to be transferred to Sunday. And then see where such an argument lands one. The Sabbatarians, who really believe that they ought to keep the Sabbath, don't keep it and can't keep it, for if they attempted really to do so they would become obviously ridiculous and unreasonable. But notice here how people will turn and twist things when once the conscience is warped. The Sabbatarians say that the fourth commandment, though still binding, is so far relaxed now as to admit of works of necessity on the Sabbath. Supposing it is relaxed, who relaxed it? But granting the necessary relaxation, does this excuse their boiling water on Sunday for their tea or coffee? Surely no one can assert that hot drinks in the middle of summer are in the smallest degree necessary. Then they will take a cab on Sunday, and discharge it a little way off their place of worship, that they may not be seen driving up in it. Apparently they think that to employ Sunday labour is not wrong, but the being seen to do so is. Many of these people have horses and servants whom, though not by any means overworked on week-days, they

let rest on Sundays, and yet they employ a poor cabman and his wretched horse, both tired out by their week's labour. And that is one way of keeping the Sabbath on Sunday! What would Moses have said to such Sabbatarians?

But leaving all this, what is the true conclusion to come to with regard to Sunday? I think it is that a period of rest is good both for body and mind, and, above all, necessary to afford time for the due cultivation of man's spiritual nature.

First among the duties and privileges of Sunday I place a *rested body*, without which we cannot worship God acceptably on the Lord's Day. I compare the man who, tired with his week's toil, comes to church only to go to sleep, to the ceremonial Jew going up to the temple to sacrifice. Far better would it have been had he stayed at home and rested. Instead of offering to God a jaded mind and body unfit for the service of man, let him repair the waste in both—remembering that his body is the temple of the Holy Ghost—and when strengthened by rest, then let him come to offer his gifts.

But although the upper classes are thus con-

fused about the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, it is upon the poor that the burden of the Sabbatical Sunday falls most heavily, and it is their cause I desire to plead. More lively services should be provided for them at church, something in the style of Messrs. Moody and Sankey, whose doctrines I consider to be often untrue and absurd, but who know how to approach the people. And after such a service was over, I would like, later in the day, to lead the poor to a museum or to the Royal Academy. This and other kindred institutions ought to be open on Sundays, for numbers of poor people have no other day for seeing art treasures. Let them go to such places and enjoy themselves. Evil results need not be anticipated. The museums at Birmingham are open on Sundays, and no harm has come of it. We can do nothing with the people unless we give them something to interest their minds besides Beer, Beer, Beer, and Bible, Bible, Bible.

Some will urge that *religious* culture alone should be given on Sunday; but when a man is starving, is it a time to question whether turtle soup or peas porridge should be given him? Let him be given *what he can take.*

But then it is said that opening museums on Sundays means labour for the attendants. I would trust the working classes of this country to take care of themselves in that matter—the masters have not found it so easy to make them work long hours on week-days as to make us fear undue imposition of labour on Sunday—besides, a good deal of the extra work might fall to voluntary unpaid labourers. I would willingly devote an hour on a Sunday afternoon myself to passing the working classes in and out of the Royal Academy, and I could find many a man to join me in such good work. I am quite sure that many clergy would be better employed in so doing than in preaching on a Sunday afternoon to half-a-dozen people half-asleep, as is the case in some of the London churches.

With regard to the opening of places of popular resort on Sundays, you remember the absurd *fiasco* which took place in Parliament a little while ago about the enforced closing of the Brighton Aquarium on Sundays. The poor, it was proposed, should be shut out from it on the only day that they can go, while the rich are allowed to visit the Horticultural and Botanical

Gardens on Sundays as much as they like, although they, with their abundant leisure, are able to go at any time during the week.

The Acts of Parliament which regulate the observance of Sunday are two; one was passed in the reign of the most dissolute of our kings, Charles II., the other in the reign of that dear, but stupid and bigoted, old king, George III. Acts which bear the impress of dissoluteness and stupidity cannot in these times long remain on the statute book, and it is probable that these two will ere long be repealed. As it is, they are not and cannot be strictly enforced now, even by the Sabbatarian party. Meanwhile, let the people and the people's representatives in Parliament educate themselves upon this question, that when the question of opening the museums on Sunday next comes up for public discussion, we may not have to assist at such an extraordinary exhibition of ignorance and mental confusion as that last presented to the country in the last parliamentary debate upon this subject.

FINIS.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018